

mended the passage of the bill. I suppose there will be no question about it.

The bill (H. R. No. 124) to establish distinct United States courts, with distinct officers, in the northern and southern judicial districts of the State of Georgia, and define their jurisdiction and powers, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That hereafter there shall be for each of the two judicial districts in the State of Georgia a judge, district attorney, marshal, and clerk, to be appointed, commissioned, and removed as provided by law for other such officers; but the officers now acting in said places in both said districts shall continue to act until their places shall be filled according to law.

SEC. 2. That the district judge now holding office for both said districts shall be assigned to and hereafter be the district judge for the southern district in said State.

SEC. 3. That the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint for the northern district in said State a district judge, who shall have all the powers and perform all the duties held and performed by the other district judges of the courts of the United States, and shall receive a salary of \$3,500 a year. And the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a district attorney and marshal of said southern district, and when the term of the present district attorney and marshal hereby assigned to the northern district shall expire the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a district attorney and marshal for said northern district, with the same powers and duties as in other cases, and with the same compensation and emoluments as are provided for the district attorney and marshal by existing laws for said districts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to have this bill explained briefly. Does this bill create a new judge in Georgia?

Mr. BROWN. There are two judicial districts in Georgia at present, and one judge has been holding court for both. The business has grown so voluminous and extensive that it is absolutely necessary to have another judge.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would inform the Senator from Iowa that the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously instructed the Senator from Arkansas to report this substitute.

Mr. ALLISON. I make no objection. I only wanted to call attention to it because my State is suffering in the same way.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish distinct United States courts, with distinct officers, in the northern and southern judicial districts of the State of Georgia."

#### PRIVATE ARMED BRIG GENERAL ARMSTRONG.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move to take up the bill (S. No. 185) for the relief of the captain, owners, officers, and crew of the late United States private armed brig General Armstrong, their heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns.

Mr. SHERMAN. That has been on the Calendar long years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PENDLETON] who reported the bill can explain it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is it the pleasure of the Senate that this bill be taken up? ["No!" "No!"]

Mr. GARLAND. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at four o'clock and forty-eight minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1882.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. POWER.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. The Evening Critic, a newspaper published in this city, in its edition of yesterday contains the following language which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Washington gas monopoly has "silent influences" which seem to close the mouths of the Congressmen. The latest instance is in the case of Hon. THOMPSON H. MURCH, who, at the last session, proposed "to investigate," but has kept an ominous silence during this Congress. Do the handsome drop-lights of the company ornament the rooms of the Maine Congressman; or are the exigencies of the Maine campaign for Congress at large being considered?

Mr. MURCH. Now, Mr. Speaker, while I and no doubt many others have seen in the Critic during the last two weeks a number of paragraphs in relation to the Washington Gaslight Company, I supposed it had abundant testimony to make good its statements without seeking by innuendo or open charge to place any member of this House in the attitude of being susceptible to the "silent influences" of any corporation, more especially a corporation which has been the subject of so much newspaper criticism as the Washington Gaslight Company. While the Critic may be pursuing its investigations with an earnest desire to correct a great evil, I am unwilling

to have my acts as a member of this House thus brought in question, and I utterly repudiate the covert attack made upon me in its columns, and will briefly as facts will permit state the reasons that have impelled me to submit at this time the resolutions that I shall now offer, and to show that instead of being corrupted by drop-lamps or the contingency of an election at large in the State of Maine, I have been conscientiously doing my duty with results that are far more convincing than attained by the Critic in its investigation of this subject.

In the Forty-sixth Congress I introduced the following resolution, which passed the House, and which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is currently reported that persons connected as stockholders or otherwise with the Washington Gaslight Company are attempting to influence members of this Congress in matters pertaining to the lighting of the public buildings and the city, and that such persons are using opportunities arising out of their official connection with Congress for such purpose: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Washington Gaslight Company is hereby directed and required to furnish this House immediately with a list of the stockholders of said company, which shall include the names of each stockholder and the number of shares held by each at the present time; also all names of stockholders of record at any time during the six months last past, and that the same be verified under oath by an officer of the said company.

Resolved, That the treasurer of the Washington Gaslight Company is hereby required to furnish to this House immediately a statement of the amount of the capital stock of the said company and a statement of every dividend which has been declared by the said company, whether the same has been made in shares, scrip, or cash, or in any other manner whatsoever, and that such statement shall include an account of the cash and all cash resources or assets on hand or held by the said company at the present time.

Mr. MURCH. In response to that resolution a communication was sent, one part of it signed by Mr. B. H. Bartol, president of the Washington Gaslight Company, and the other part by Mr. C. C. Glover, its treasurer. These two letters form Miscellaneous Document No. 15, Forty-sixth Congress, third session. I have a copy of it here, and I assert that a document more clearly intended to becloud and conceal the facts demanded by Congress was never written or printed. It is one of the most adroit specimens of the use of language to conceal facts ever presented to either House; but I have analyzed these letters of Mr. Bartol and Mr. Glover, upon the theory presented by the Critic, and the result is that I am satisfied it is our duty, as the only legislators for the District of Columbia, and the creators of this monster gas monopoly that is robbing the Government and this District, to interfere and protect them.

In opening his letter Mr. Glover tells us that the Washington Gaslight Company was organized in July, 1848, without telling us how much the capital stock was, or how much of the stock was paid in, though we find further on that the capital stock when the company organized was \$500,000, but whether it was all paid in or not we are nowhere informed. For the present I shall assume that it was. That is \$20 in money in 1848 and 1849 for each of the 25,000 shares of the company's stock.

The second and third paragraphs of Mr. Glover's letter show that from January, 1850, to August, 1868, a period of eighteen years, 154½ per cent., \$772,500 in cash, was paid to the fortunate holders of the stock of the Washington Gas Company.

Mr. Glover says these dividends average 7.6 per cent., which would not be too large a return for the money invested. But Mr. Glover forgets himself. In the next paragraph (5) he says:

November 1, 1868, the cash cost of the works exceeded \$1,000,000, while the capital stock was but \$500,000. The company having, by act of Congress approved March 24, 1868, obtained the authority to increase the capital stock to \$1,000,000, the directors at this time issued to each of the then stockholders as many additional shares of stock as they then held. This was considered to be but just and right, as the earnings of the company, beyond dividends paid, had been invested in increasing the value of the works.

As there had been but \$500,000 cash capital paid in, it would have been plain, even if Mr. Glover had not said so, that the earnings of the company, beyond dividends, had been invested in increasing the value of the works. Mr. Glover says "the cash cost of the works exceeded \$1,000,000;" how much the excess was we are left to find from Mr. Bartol's letter, who says page 1, "the cost of the works then was \$1,170,056;" so that the "earnings beyond dividends" invested is the difference between \$1,170,056 and the \$500,000 paid-up capital of the company; that is, \$670,056. Add this to the \$752,500 paid in dividends and the earnings of this company for 18½ years on \$1,442,556, an average of \$77,956.10 or 15.51 per cent. per annum.

The next paragraph of Mr. Glover's letter gives the dividends from 1868 to February, 1881, and reads as follows:

In February, 1869, 5 per cent. was paid; 10 per cent. was paid in May, and 5 per cent. in August of that year. In February, 1870, 5 per cent. was paid, and the same in August of that year. In February, 1871, 5 per cent. was paid; 5 per cent. was paid in April, and 5 per cent. in August of that year. In February, 1872, 5 per cent. was paid; 5 per cent. was paid in May, and 5 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1873, 5 per cent. was paid; 10 per cent. was paid in May, and 5 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1874, 5 per cent. was paid, and 50 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1875, 5 per cent. was paid; 5 per cent. was paid in May, and 10 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1876, 5 per cent. was paid; 10 per cent. was paid in August, and 50 per cent. was paid in October of that year. In February, 1877, 5 per cent. was paid; 5 per cent. was paid in May, and 5 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1878, 5 per cent. was paid, and 10 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1879, 5 per cent. was paid; 5 per cent. was paid in June, and 5 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1880, 5 per cent. was paid; 5 per cent. was paid in June, and 5 per cent. was paid in August of that year. In February, 1881, 5 per cent. was paid.

As Mr. Glover failed to tell the amount of dividends paid each year, wrote the paragraph in the very singular way it is written probably to prevent telling it, let me, in a much less space, say just what Mr. Glover ought to have said: dividends for 1869, 20 per cent.; for 1870, 10 per cent.; in 1871, 15 per cent.; in 1872, 15 per cent.; in 1873, 20 per cent.; in 1874, 55 per cent.; in 1875, 20 per cent.; in 1876, 65 per cent.; in 1877, 15 per cent.; in 1878, 15 per cent.; in 1879, 15 per cent.; in 1880, 15 per cent., and in February, 1881, 5 per cent.

But Mr. Glover does not tell us upon what amount of stock these dividends were paid, and to read his letter the inference would be that these dividends were upon the original capital stock of the company, \$500,000. An examination of Mr. Bartol's letter in connection with Mr. Glover's enables us to arrive at the truth, which these gentlemen have studiously endeavored to conceal.

Their gas company's stock was increased to \$1,000,000 November 1, 1868, (see Glover's letter,) and to \$1,500,000 in June, 1872, and to \$2,000,000 November 15, 1876. (See Bartol's letter, paragraph 2, page 2.) With these facts we can see how much the company paid as not stated by Mr. Glover.

Year.	Dividends.	Money paid.
<i>Capital stock, \$1,000,000.</i>		
1869.....	20 per cent.	\$200,000
1870.....	10 per cent.	100,000
1871.....	15 per cent.	150,000
1872 (to May).....	10 per cent.	100,000
Total in less than four years.....	55 per cent.	550,000
<i>Capital stock, \$1,500,000.</i>		
1872, (August).....	5 per cent.	75,000
1873.....	20 per cent.	300,000
1874.....	55 per cent.	825,000
1875.....	20 per cent.	300,000
1876.....	65 per cent.	975,000
Total in four and a half years.....	165 per cent.	2,475,000
<i>Capital stock, \$2,000,000.</i>		
1877.....	15 per cent.	300,000
1878.....	15 per cent.	300,000
1879.....	15 per cent.	300,000
1880.....	15 per cent.	300,000
1881, (February).....	5 per cent.	100,000
Total in four years and four months.....	65 per cent.	1,300,000
Grand total.....		4,325,000

For three years and four months on \$1,000,000 the company paid 55 per cent., \$550,000 in cash on \$500,000 capital, for Mr. Glover admits that the first increase of stock was "water"—35.3 per cent. per annum.

Mr. Bartol says in his letter:

In accordance with the terms of this act, \$500,000 was allotted among the then stockholders in proportion to the number of shares held by each. Said stock was called scrip stock, because it was to be paid for in installments when called.

When the last installment was paid, the scrip certificates were called in and canceled and capital stock certificates issued in their place; the sum of \$20 had been paid in money on each scrip share, and the capital stock shares represented the same amount. In this manner the capital stock was increased from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000.

This in allusion to the act of May, 1872, which allowed the company to increase its capital stock to \$2,000,000. You will observe the \$500,000 scrip stock "was allotted among the then stockholders in proportion to the number of shares held by each;" that is, the man who held two shares of capital stock received one share of scrip stock. Of course the \$500,000 was issued as soon after the passage of the act as practicable, say in July. Then from August, 1872, to October, 1876, 165 per cent., \$2,475,000, was paid in dividends on \$1,500,000. That is 40 per cent. a year on the increased capital, 120 per cent. per annum on the only money ever paid in by the stockholders.

"November 15, 1876," says Mr. Bartol, "another allotment of \$500,000 of scrip stock was made in the same manner as the first allotment;" that is, "to the then stockholders, in proportion to the stock held by each;" each person holding three shares of stock received one share of scrip stock, and from this date the dividends were upon \$2,000,000 stock.

For the four years from February, 1877, to January, 1881, 15 per cent. on \$2,000,000 was paid each year; that is, \$300,000, or 60 per cent. per annum on the original amount paid in.

Now, look carefully at the language of Mr. Bartol. He endeavors to lead us to the belief that when the stock was raised from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 and from that sum to \$2,000,000 the parties to whom the stock was allotted paid their money for it in installments. He is careful not to assert that they paid it. He said "the sum of \$20 had been paid in money on each share" before the stock was issued. How was it paid and who paid it? Mr. Glover answers the question to any one who will read between the lines of his letter and find out what Mr. Glover does not want to tell.

In July, 1872, the scrip shares were issued, in August of that year

a 5 per cent. dividend was paid, and in the year 1873 20 per cent. was paid—that is \$375,000, while in 1874, a year of great depression, 55 per cent., or \$825,000, was paid in dividends. In the eighteen years of profusion and plenty that preceded Black Friday the gas company paid its stockholders \$375,000, and in the year of depression which followed it paid them \$825,000.

Does any reasonable man believe that the difference in the expenditures and receipts justify this difference in dividends? Of course not. How, then, account for it? By the very pleasant process of reason and induction.

The money received in 1872 and 1873, instead of being paid out as dividends, was withheld to pay the installments on the scrip stock issued. As soon as this was paid up a tremendous dividend of 55 per cent. was paid.

And this process was repeated. Congress had authorized an increase to \$2,000,000. Three hundred thousand dollars had been allotted and paid, and it was determined to make another allotment. Twenty per cent. dividend was paid in 1875 and 65 per cent. paid in 1876. Think of it, \$975,000 dividends paid in one year. Nearly 200 per cent. on the original capital stock. Then an additional \$500,000 of stock was issued, and the dividends reduced to 15 per cent. per annum, at which figure they have been kept that the scrip stock might be paid for, and for other reasons which will be shown.

The analysis of these letters affords a convincing proof that not a dollar has ever been paid into the capital stock of this gas company except the original \$500,000.

Now for "the other reasons" why the dividends have been kept at 15 per cent. per annum, (which is, however, 60 per cent. per annum on all the money ever paid in.) In 1877 there was a general belief that water-gas could be made cheaply, and the subject of electrical lighting began to be discussed. And Mr. Bartol tells us in his letter that—

Under these circumstances the board of directors of this company have deemed it a duty to the stockholders they represent to prepare for this contingency, and they have retained and invested a cash balance of \$650,000 to be held in reserve to enable the company to make such additions to their works as will allow them to reduce the price of gas to its lowest point, both for illuminating and fuel purposes, in hope that a very large increase of consumption may compensate them for the outlay.

Besides which duplicate works were built, costing we are not informed how much. This \$650,000 is part of the earnings of the company, and is entitled to be classed as dividends, as would also the duplicate works.

Now, sir, let me recapitulate what this company has done, what money it invested, and what it has received. I firmly believe that not one dollar has ever been paid into the capital stock of the company except the original subscription, and I think I have demonstrated this to the satisfaction of every one here; so that I assume that there is an investment of \$500,000. I propose to give Mr. Bartol the benefit of every direct assertion he has made, and will admit that only \$375,000 of the last \$500,000 of scrip shares has been paid for. I have here a city paper which quotes Washington Gas Company stock at \$40, scrip stock, \$32; and we can, through the information derived from this document and this paper, arrive approximately at the sum realized from the investment of \$500,000:

Value of works (see Mr. Bartol's letter).....	\$1,860,735
Value of duplicate works (estimated—see page 2, report).....	250,000
Value of 75,000 shares of stock, at \$40.....	3,000,000
Value of 25,000 shares of scrip stock, at \$32.....	800,000
Cash dividends from 1850 to 1868.....	722,500
Cash dividends from 1869 to 1872.....	550,000
Cash dividends from 1872 to 1876.....	2,475,000
Cash dividends from 1877 to 1881.....	1,200,000
	10,858,235
Deduct cash capital paid in.....	500,000
Profits in thirty-one years.....	10,358,235

These figures show a profit of \$334,116 to the gas company for each year of its existence from January 1, 1850, to January 1, 1881. That is 66.8 per cent. per annum. I believe this is correct. The report made in response to the resolution that was adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress was intended to deceive Congress, who made this corporation and gave it power to extort from the people, and we should now interfere to curb its blood-sucking tendencies or abolish it. If I am mistaken there is one way, and only one way, for the company to prove it, and that is by the examination which I now propose.

If the Washington Gaslight Company has been honest in its dealings with Congress it would not fear the examination. If, as I believe and assert, it has been deceiving while it was robbing the people, then it will fear and endeavor to prevent investigation.

[During the delivery of Mr. MURCH's personal explanation the following proceedings occurred:

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Maine is not discussing a question of privilege.

Mr. MURCH. I am vindicating myself against the charges made in the Critic, a newspaper published in this city, and I hold that it is a privileged question and I have a right to defend myself against the attacks of that paper.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it has listened to the charge as made in the paper as read, and it is of the opinion that

the gentleman has a right to take the floor on a question of privilege. The Chair is equally certain, however, that it does not extend to the gentleman from Maine the right to go into a review of the history of the company that is referred to; that it does not involve his right to criticize anybody outside of the charge directly made against himself; that this question of privilege extends only to the right of the member taking the floor and making any explanation or denial he may please to make. The Chair cannot draw any very fine distinction, and perhaps the House could not, but the gentleman must confine himself to the matter of the charge against himself and not extend his remarks into a review of the history of the company referred to. To allow this to run into a general debate would violate the privileges of the House.

Mr. REED. Perhaps it would be satisfactory to my colleague to have the remaining portion of his remarks printed.

Mr. MURCH. But I have a resolution to offer. I wish, however, just now, to say a word in reply to the remarks of the Chair. I am charged with having attempted an investigation during the last Congress and with having been silenced by influences which implied drop-lamps and contingent funds for election purposes. But if the House thinks I cannot go into the matter, of course I must desist.

The SPEAKER. To the extent necessary to make denial of the charge contained in the newspaper referred to, the Chair holds the gentleman is entirely in order.]

Mr. MURCH. I now offer the following preamble and resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas certain charges have appeared in the public press questioning the integrity of members of this House in connection with legislation in the interest of the Washington Gaslight Company, and also alleging that corrupt or improper means have been resorted to to procure such legislation: Therefore,

*Be it resolved*, That a special committee of five members of this House be appointed by the Speaker, with leave to sit during the sessions and in the recess of Congress, whose duty it shall be to examine and investigate the business of the Washington Gaslight Company from its organization under the charter originally granted by Congress to the date of their report, in regard to the cost of the works, expenses of conducting the same, cost of coal, apparatus, pipes, labor, &c.; the outlay and disbursements of said company, its earnings, dividends, whether of stock, scrip, or cash, or increased value of works, property, or assets. The said committee shall likewise inquire into and report to this House the names of all stockholders in said company at the date of their report; and shall inquire into the offers to supply or the supplying of any persons or parties with gas free of cost, or at a nominal cost, within ten years previous to such report, the relations of said company's officials or stockholders, or either of them, to this House, or to any Department of the Government, or to the District government in an official capacity since the incorporation of said company. They shall likewise report the actual cost of producing gas in the District of Columbia during the term of said company's corporate existence; the amounts charged for the same during said period; the amounts paid each year by the District government and by the Government of the United States for gas supplies by said company; the amount of gas consumed by private individuals in said District supplied by said company each year since 1878; the amount and value of coke, naphtha, coal tar, or other products of gas-making, produced and used or sold by said company each year; the capacity and character of the works of said company; the relations or dealings of said company or its agents with members of Congress or officers or persons officially connected with this House or the District government or the Departments of the executive in this city, together with such further information as the said committee may deem of importance in this connection to this House; and that said committee be empowered to employ experts, and to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, and that the expenses of such committee in its investigations of this subject be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives: *And be it further resolved*, That it shall be the duty of said committee to report to this House, in pursuance of the terms of these resolutions, on or as soon after the second Monday of December, 1883, as possible.

Mr. CAMP. I object to the consideration of that resolution, and submit that it is not a privileged question. I have no objection, however, to its being referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MURCH. I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. CAMP. I object to it.

Mr. MURCH. I do not think the gentleman's objection can prevent my introducing the resolution. It is well known committees of investigation have been formed in this House on newspaper charges, notably so under Mr. Speaker Blaine, and I hold the preamble recites a question of privilege.

Mr. CAMP. I submit this resolution does not propose to investigate the charges made in a newspaper article but to investigate the gas company. It is not a privileged resolution. It can only come in by unanimous consent, and I object to its introduction.

Mr. COBB. I trust the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection. I have no doubt that resolution will draw out a state of facts that will be alarming and astonishing to every gentleman in this House.

Mr. CAMP. I object to its consideration now.

Mr. COBB. This is a very important matter.

Mr. ROBESON. It is not a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MURCH] submits the resolution which has been read. Is there unanimous consent for its present consideration?

Mr. HAZELTON. There is not.

Mr. CAMP. I object.

Mr. MURCH. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. CAMP. Let it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MURCH. No, sir; I desire it shall go to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. ROBESON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it should go to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MURCH. It relates to the manufacture of gas, and should go to the Committee on Manufactures.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was of opinion the resolution related largely to the conduct of certain persons connected with the company and not at all with the method of manufacturing gas. The rule relating to the Committee on the District of Columbia is so broad as to require everything connected with the District of every character to be referred to that committee. The Chair thinks that is the appropriate committee.

Mr. BLAND. Is it not in order to move to refer to another committee?

Mr. ROBESON. I ask if the resolution, having been objected to, is now before the House?

The SPEAKER. It is not before the House for consideration. The House is considering the question of reference. The Chair would hold, under the rules, the resolution should be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. REED. I ask for a vote on the proposition which I made yesterday, as modified by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. HEWITT,] in accordance with the unanimous consent given last night.

The SPEAKER. Before that the Chair, in the absence of objection, will submit certain personal requests of members.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WEST, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. MOSGROVE, until Monday next, on account of sickness in his family and very important business.

To Mr. ROBINSON, of Ohio, for ten days, from and after the 22d instant, on account of important business.

To Mr. BENJAMIN WOOD indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

#### CORRECTION.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I desire to correct the Journal read this morning. On the tariff-commission proposition I voted "no" and I am not recorded as voting.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's statement will be taken and the Journal will be corrected.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I desire, further, to state that my colleague [Mr. PETTIBONE] was paired with Mr. HERBERT, of Alabama. That pair was not announced yesterday.

#### GENEVA AWARD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine, [Mr. REED,] in accordance with the order of the House made on yesterday, by unanimous consent, now moves that the rules be suspended, and that the resolution which the Clerk will read be adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That House bill No. 4197, re-establishing the court of commissioners of Alabama claims, and for the distribution of the unappropriated moneys of the Geneva award, be taken from the Committee of the Whole and considered in the House as in committee on April 11, and thence from day to day until finally disposed of, but not to interfere with the revenue and general appropriation bills, the tariff-commission bill, and the bill referring private claims to the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and adopting the resolution which has been read.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

On the question of ordering the yeas and nays there were—ayes 38, noes 105.

So (the affirmative being more than one-fifth of the whole vote) the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 163, nays 55, not voting 74; as follows:

#### YEAS—163.

Aiken,	Crapo,	Harris, Benj. W.	Martin,
Aldrich,	Cullen,	Haseltine,	McClure,
Anderson,	Davis, George R.	Haskell,	McCook,
Barr,	Dawes,	Haw,	McKinley,
Bayne,	Deering,	Hazelton,	McLane,
Belford,	De Motte,	Henderson,	Miles,
Berry,	Dezendorf,	Hepburn,	Miller,
Bingham,	Dingley,	Hewitt, Abram S.	Money,
Bragg,	Dowd,	Hewitt, G. W.	Moore,
Brewer,	Dugro,	Hiscock,	Morey,
Briggs,	Dunnell,	Horr,	Mosgrove,
Browne,	Dwight,	Houk,	Moulton,
Brumm,	Ermentrout,	Hubbell,	Muldrow,
Buck,	Errett,	Humphrey,	Murch,
Buckner,	Farwell, Chas. B.	Jacobs,	Mutcher,
Burrows, Julius C.	Farwell, Sewell S.	Jones, George W.	Neal,
Burrows, Jos. H.	Finley,	Jones, Phineas	Norcross,
Butterworth,	Fisher,	Jorgensen,	O'Neill,
Calkins,	Flower,	Kasson,	Orth,
Camp,	Ford,	Kelley,	Pacheco,
Campbell,	Fulkerson,	Kenna,	Pago,
Candler,	Garrison,	Ketcham,	Paul,
Carpenter,	George,	Knott,	Payson,
Cassidy,	Guenther,	Lacey,	Peddie,
Caswell,	Hall,	Ladd,	Phelps,
Cobb,	Hammond, John	Lewis,	Pound,
Converse,	Hammond, N. J.	Manning,	Randall,
Cornell,	Harmer,	Marsh,	Ranney,

Ray,	Shallenberger,	Thompson, Wm. G.	Ward,
Reed,	Sherwin,	Tillman,	Washburn,
Rice, John B.	Shultz,	Townsend, Amos	Watson,
Rice, Theron M.	Singleton, Jas. W.	Townsend, R. W.	Webber,
Rice, William W.	Skinner,	Tucker,	West,
Rich,	Smith, Dietrich C.	Tyler,	White,
Ritchie,	Spaulding,	Updegraff, J. T.	Williams, Chas. G.
Robeson,	Speer,	Updegraff, Thomas	Willits,
Robinson, Geo. D.	Spooner,	Urner,	Wilson,
Robinson, James S.	Strait,	Valentine,	Wise, George D.
Russell,	Talbott,	Van Horn,	Wise, Morgan R.
Ryan,	Taylor,	Wait,	Wood, Walter A.
Scranton,	Thomas,	Walker,	

## NAYS—55.

Armfield,	Curtin,	Holman,	Smith, A. Herr
Blackburn,	Davidson,	Hooker,	Sparks,
Blanchard,	Davis, Lowndes H.	House,	Springer,
Bland,	Denster,	Hutchins,	Stockslager,
Blount,	Dibble,	Jones, James K.	Thompson, P. B.
Buchanan,	Dibrell,	Matson,	Turner, Henry G.
Caldwell,	Evins,	McKenzie,	Turner, Oscar
Chalmers,	Forney,	McMillin,	Vance,
Chapman,	Geddes,	Mills,	Warner,
Clardy,	Gunter,	Phister,	Wellborn,
Clark,	Hardy,	Robertson,	Whitthorne,
Cock,	Harris, Henry S.	Shackelford,	Williams, Thomas
Covington,	Hatch,	Simonton,	Willis.
Cravens,	Hoblitzell,	Singleton, Otho R.	

## NOT VOTING—74.

Allen,	Culberson,	Klotz,	Robinson, Wm. E.
Atherton,	Cutts,	Latham,	Rosecrans,
Atkins,	Darrell,	Leedom,	Ross,
Barbour,	Dunn,	Le Fevre,	Scales,
Beach,	Ellis,	Lindsey,	Scoville,
Belmont,	Frost,	Lord,	Shelley,
Beltzhoover,	Gibson,	Mason,	Smith, J. Hyatt
Black,	Godshalk,	McCoid,	Steele,
Bliss,	Groat,	Morrison,	Stephens,
Bowman,	Hardenbergh,	Morse,	Stone,
Cabell,	Heilman,	Nolan,	Upson,
Cannon,	Herbert,	Oates,	Van Aernam,
Carlisle,	Herndon,	Parker,	Van Voorhis,
Chace,	Hill,	Peirce,	Wadsworth,
Clements,	Hoge,	Pettibone,	Wheeler,
Colerick,	Hubbs,	Prescott,	Wood, Benjamin
Cox, Samuel S.	Jadwin,	Reagan,	Young.
Cox, William R.	Joyce,	Richardson, D. P.	
Crowley,	King,	Richardson, Jno. S.	

So (two-thirds voting in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was adopted.

The following pairs were announced:

Mr. PEIRCE with Mr. BARBOUR.  
 Mr. BOWMAN with Mr. ALLEN.  
 Mr. GODSHALK with Mr. DUNN.  
 Mr. SMITH, of Illinois, with Mr. BUCKNER.  
 Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. LINDSEY.  
 Mr. VAN AERNAM with Mr. SCOVILLE.  
 Mr. YOUNG with Mr. LE FEVRE.  
 Mr. MASON with Mr. LATHAM.  
 Mr. RICHARDSON, of New York, with Mr. RICHARDSON, of South Carolina.

Mr. CORNELL with Mr. NOLAN.  
 Mr. HEILMAN with Mr. KLOTZ.  
 Mr. BEACH with Mr. VAN VOORHIS.  
 Mr. SHELLEY with Mr. PRESCOTT.  
 Mr. HERBERT with Mr. PETTIBONE.  
 Mr. MCCOOK with Mr. KING.  
 Mr. MORRISON with Mr. STEELE.  
 Mr. CUTTS with Mr. MANNING.  
 Mr. OATES with Mr. JOYCE.  
 Mr. ROSS with Mr. JADWIN.  
 Mr. CANNON with Mr. ATKINS.  
 Mr. BLOUNT with Mr. RICE of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. HILL with Mr. HARDENBERGH.

Mr. MCCOOK. I am paired with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. KING, on political questions. Not regarding this as a political question, I have voted.

Mr. HEILMAN, (having voted.) I was paired with Mr. KLOTZ, of Pennsylvania, until I should return to this city. As he is not here this morning I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS, (having voted.) I am paired with my colleague, Mr. BEACH, except when my vote is necessary to make a quorum. It not being necessary on this question at this time, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MURCH. I desire to state that I am recorded as not having voted last night on the resolution of my colleague, Mr. REED. I was affected with severe neuralgic pains in my head and left the Hall about half-past four o'clock yesterday afternoon. Had I been present I would have voted for that resolution.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I am paired with Mr. BLOUNT, with the right to vote on this question, and I have therefore voted.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the names be dispensed with.

Mr. BLAND. I object.

The names of those voting were then read by the Clerk, and the result of the vote was announced as above stated.

## NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent to submit for consideration and adoption at this time the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That House bill No. 4167, to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, be taken from the House Calendar and made the special order for the 15th day of April next, after the morning hour, and from day to day until disposed of, not to antagonize general appropriation and revenue bills.

Mr. McMILLIN. I object.

Mr. BLAND. I object.

Mr. KENNA. Everybody objects to that.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the resolution is not before the House.

Mr. PAGE. I call for the regular order.

## STATISTICAL ABSTRACT, NO. 4.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that it has a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the fourth number of the statistical abstract of the United States prepared by the Treasury Department and transmitted to the House some time since. It was referred by the House to the Committee on Printing. The Chair is informed that it has been usual to refer such communications to the Committee on Ways and Means and at the same time order them to be printed. If there is no objection the change of reference will be made and the document will be ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Committee on Printing has already considered the matter, and we are of the opinion that a sufficient number of these documents has already been printed, and that there is no necessity for printing additional copies.

Mr. RANDALL. Has the usual number been printed?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it has never been printed by order of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is a general law requiring it to be printed.

Mr. KASSON. The Committee on Ways and Means are prepared to request that the document be printed.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the Chair will permit the matter to lie over until to-morrow, I will in the mean time examine the law on the subject.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest that the document be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means with power to order the printing if they deem it necessary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has in view not this document but the ordinary report of the expenditures of the Department.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have examined this very document carefully, and from that examination it is my impression that the printing has already been ordered.

Mr. RANDALL. These reports from the Statistical Bureau, under the charge of Mr. Nimmo, are of great interest not only to members of Congress but to the whole country. I think this printing is very desirable.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, that the House may understand what this document is.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
 March 17, 1882.

SIR: On the 25th of January last this Department transmitted to the House of Representatives the fourth number of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, prepared by this Department. The information contained therein is of value, and I have the honor to respectfully suggest that the volume be printed at as early a day as may be practicable.

Very respectfully,

CHARLES J. FOLGER,  
 Secretary.

Hon. J. WARREN KEIFER,  
 Speaker House of Representatives.

Mr. RANDALL. If I am correctly informed, similar documents have been heretofore presented to the House.

The SPEAKER. There have been three preceding ones.

Mr. RANDALL. This document should certainly follow the same course as the previous ones.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that this has not been printed.

Mr. KASSON. The action proposed by the Chair is what I know from previous action of the Committee on Ways and Means would be desired by them; that is, that the document be referred to that committee and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The three preceding volumes of similar character to this have all been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDALL. If the cost of printing in this case would exceed \$500 I presume the law would require that the question of printing should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand this to be the annual report of statistics of commerce, from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that this would not come within the rule relating to printing merely for the House, because the law requires these documents to be printed.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask that the title of the document be read again.

The Clerk read as follows:

The fourth number of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, prepared by the Treasury Department.

Mr. DUNNELL. No such document as that is embraced in the general law.

The SPEAKER. Unless it is covered by general terms.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand, however, that this document contains the message of the President of the United States and the accompanying statistics.

Mr. KASSON. There can be no question, I think, as to the propriety and necessity of this printing.

Mr. SPRINGER. If this matter be allowed to go over until tomorrow the Committee on Printing will examine and report upon it.

Mr. KASSON. We only ask that the usual number be printed. The committee can make examination as to the question of printing any additional number.

Mr. SPRINGER. From the examination I made, I was of the opinion that the usual number had already been printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been informed from the printing office that no copies of this have been printed.

Mr. SPRINGER. The delay of one day will not make any difference in this matter; therefore I object to the change of reference to-day. To-morrow I shall be able to state definitely whether I am mistaken in my present impression, based on my previous examination of this subject.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection attention will be again called to the subject to-morrow.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CASWELL. I ask that the bill making appropriations for the postal service for the year ending June 30, 1883, which is now on the Speaker's table with Senate amendments, be taken up and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and that the bill as amended, with the amendments numbered, be printed.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I desire, under Rule XX, to reserve at this time points of order on all Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. It will be time enough to do that when the bill is reported back.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I think that for abundance of caution I will reserve points of order at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can make points of order when the Committee on Appropriations report the bill back.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. The Chair will allow me to say, it has once been ruled that if points of order are not made or reserved before the committee takes the bill it is doubtful whether they will be in season afterward. I will not ask that the amendments be read now, but am content to reserve points of order so that our rights may be saved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to taking this appropriation bill from the Speaker's table, referring it, with the Senate amendments, to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordering it printed with the amendments? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves all points of order.

#### SUFFERERS BY MISSISSIPPI OVERFLOW.

Mr. GIBSON. I ask unanimous consent to have read a telegram from the commissioners who are distributing in the State of Louisiana the relief voted by Congress to the sufferers by the overflow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE RELIEF COMMISSIONERS,  
(194 Gravier Street,)  
New Orleans, March 20, 1882.

GENTLEMEN: As the special commissioners appointed by the governor to distribute the rations provided by the General Government, we beg leave to place before you a statement of the facts so that you may intelligently co-operate with us in giving relief to our people. At the outset of the waters, as is always the case when a great calamity threatens a people, many exaggerations were circulated which tended to create doubts as to the extent of the dangers which threatened our State; but as crevasses followed in quick succession, covering territory which it was hoped would escape, everybody was confirmed in the opinion that superhuman efforts would be required and that in many localities distress, and in some starvation, would ensue, whereupon our worthy governor promptly applied for relief.

To date we have received 216,000 rations of bread and bacon, and have issued and shipped to 21,966 applicants rations for fifteen days, commencing 14th instant, amounting to 329,000 pounds of flour and meal and 161,000 pounds of bacon. We are using the utmost precaution to have the issues made applied as intended by the Government. Our supplies are entirely exhausted by to-day's shipments to Madison Parish. We have now before us additional demands for fully 300,000 rations; and the calls are increasing daily from the inundated parishes which can most readily communicate with us; and we know of many remote sections whence further calls must soon come to us. The tier of parishes bordering on the Mississippi, from Carroll down to Point Coupée, are in respect to the bottom lands, with here and there a few exceptions, submerged, the waters passing through the tiers as crevasses, forcing themselves down into Concordia from the rear and seeking an exit to the Mississippi, while the waters from the Point Coupée crevasses, combining at about False River with the Morganza and Scott crevasses, in the same parish, are sweeping down the interior parishes, and have made their appearance on the highlands of Saint Martin, Saint Mary, Terre Bonne, Assumption, and a portion of La Fourche.

The Ouachita section, interspersed with various streams which are now at full tide, is becoming daily submerged; and cries for relief are pouring down to us beyond our ability to supply. The lower La Fourche section has been subjected to various crevasses upon which labor has been assiduously applied with the result of

closing almost all the breaches except one, the Pittman, about midway between the Beaux and Lockport, east bank, and one about fifteen miles below Lockport, which must inevitably ruin many poor people on the banks and in the interior. This morning we learn of breaks at Platonville, east bank of Bayou La Fourche, and one on the east bank of the Mississippi nearly opposite Donaldsonville; and many dangerous points are reported to us between Baton Rouge and this place. The lower portion of the river from this place down is suffering from crevasses which occurred on the Fleitas Story and Live Oaks, places in Plaquemine Parish, the second of which must inundate Saint Bernard Parish and reduce to distress many persons in that section. Even the Red River Valley is being seriously hurt by the swelling of the Red River and connecting streams. *En résumé*, it certainly appears that the entire State, excepting the western tier and Florida parishes, must be very seriously affected, involving in many instances starvation, if relief is not afforded. Every day earnest and sincere appeals are made to us for rations for man and beast.

To specify particularly what is needed to save from starvation is absolutely impossible, because we have not got the data required, but you may rest assured the devastation is unprecedented, and will require to avert a great calamity the liberal and generous hand of the Government, for though relief be given now, it will be only monetary, for these people will be in greater need thirty days hence than now. Should it be deemed wise to furnish supplies commensurate with the needs of man and beast, we have to request you to urge that a Government officer be detailed to make the distribution, to whom will be given our very best co-operation.

M. GILLIS,  
ISAAC SCHENCK,  
LOUIS BUSH,  
Commissioners for Louisiana.

To the SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES of Louisiana.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PAGE. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the morning hour for reports of committees be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

#### CONTESTED ELECTION CASES.

Mr. CALKINS. I desire to give notice that on Saturday next, unless something which I do not now know should intervene, I shall call up for consideration the contested election case of Campbell *vs.* Cannon; also the case with reference to the seat claimed by Mr. Ball, as Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. KENNA. There is a special order for next Saturday.

Mr. CALKINS. I wish to say further that with the present feeling of the committee I do not know that any discussion will take place on either case, except in the Alaska case by the claimant himself. In the other case I do not suppose that much discussion will be indulged unless members so notify me between this time and next Saturday.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a special order for next Saturday.

Mr. COX, of New York. When does the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] propose to have a vote taken on the Chinese bill?

Mr. PAGE. I want to give the largest latitude to debate; but I give notice that if agreeable to both sides of the House I shall call the previous question at three o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. COX, of New York. I see no objection to that.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I hope my friend from California will not call the previous question until he has allowed further opportunity for debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California simply gives notice.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to understand whether there are to be any votes during the rest of to-day, or whether the time is to be occupied exclusively in debate. I suggest that this had better be understood before the debate begins.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to state except as indicated by the gentleman from California, [Mr. PAGE.]

Mr. RANDALL. Then I ask by unanimous consent the remainder of this day be occupied in debate only on the Chinese bill.

Mr. KASSON. I object to that.

Mr. RANDALL. Then I shall feel myself called upon to object to unanimous consent.

Mr. HOOKER. I call for the regular order of business.

#### D. T. KIRBY.

On motion of Mr. CLARDY, by unanimous consent, leave was granted for the withdrawal from the files of the House of the papers in the case of D. T. Kirby.

#### GEORGE W. TAYLOR.

On motion of Mr. PAUL, by unanimous consent, leave was granted for the withdrawal from the files of the House of the papers accompanying a bill for the relief of George W. Taylor.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KENNA. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that the gentleman from Iowa does not object to this day being devoted to the discussion of the Chinese bill, but only asks in addition that members may have the opportunity to offer amendments, not that they shall be voted on to-day, but that they shall be offered and considered as pending.

Mr. KASSON. That is all I desire; that members may have the opportunity during the day of suggesting amendments to the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. I am willing to assent to that proposition if it is confined exclusively to amendments to the Chinese bill.

Mr. McLANE. I object to anything but the regular order of business.

## CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of the bill (S. No. 71) to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese; on which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCURE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Speaker, I confess, and I confess it without compunction, that I have often been charmed, especially on the Fourth of July, with the grandeur of the idea that our shores are open to all the races of mankind, from the Esquimaux to the Patagonian, from the Mongolian to the South Sea Islander—in fact, that we are a sort of continental menagerie of nationalities, a sort of an ethnological animal show, in which all the races of men, mixed and unmixed, pure and mongrel, Christian and pagan, civilized and barbarous, warlike and unwarlike, monogamous and polygamous, black and white, yellow and red, dwell together in peace and harmony. To such a zoological paradise of the races some of the philosophers of this body invite the American people in the name of sentiment. In contemplating this poetic idea, ecstatic emotions are likely to be kindled in one's breast. But it is all poetry and no reality.

The American courts have refused to recognize the doctrine of expatriation as applied to the acts of our own citizens, and if there is any recognition of this doctrine on our part it is in treaties negotiated since 1867. I propose to discuss this question briefly, not from the stand-point of sentiment, not from any lofty pinnacle of aerial morality, but from the unpoetic stand-point of common sense.

And the first question to be settled is, have we the right to suspend Chinese immigration as contemplated in the bill?

By the code of public law, old as civilization, every nation has a right to allow or disallow the immigration of foreigners. This right is inherent in the sovereignty and territorial jurisdiction of every independent power. In addition to this right of international law, we have secured an express right by treaty with China to regulate, to limit, and to suspend Chinese immigration. The only qualification in the treaty is that the limitation, regulation, or suspension shall be reasonable. What are twenty years in the chronology of the Chinese Empire, which is older than the pyramids of Egypt, from whose summit twenty centuries looked down upon the French when they fought, three-quarters of a century ago, a battle under their shadow? In the computation of time twenty years in the history of the Chinese Empire is but a day.

Christianity has been arraigned on this floor by opponents of this measure, because of its failure to reclaim from original sin 100,000 coolies on the Pacific coast. They might as well arraign American institutions for their failure to Americanize them. Christianity needs no defense here or elsewhere. It is amply able to take care of itself in the conflict with Asiatic paganism or any other form of religious delusion existing on earth. While American institutions may be powerless to implant in the heart of a Chinaman a sentiment of liberty, no man will doubt the ability of the American people to maintain and defend constitutional government on this continent.

But some gentlemen argue that China will take umbrage at this measure, and therefore our commercial interests in that direction will be put in great jeopardy. Now there are two answers to this argument: first, we simply enforce a right guaranteed to us by solemn treaty stipulations which can afford no just cause for umbrage on the part of China; and, secondly, the Chinese merchants, above all merchants in the world, are incited by cupidity and will trade in whatever quarter of the globe they can trade to the greatest advantage. Why, Mr. Speaker, twenty years ago England and France at the point of the bayonet extorted a treaty from China, and yet that act of war and invasion did not compromise in the least the commercial interests of those two great and enlightened powers.

But other gentlemen apprehend far more serious results than the interruption of friendly commercial relations with China. They fancy that if Chinese immigration is cut off desolation will overspread the Pacific States; that civilization will stand still; that material growth will be arrested; that the locomotive will cease to scream in the Sacramento Valley; that the wheat fields will go untilled; that the grape and peach and apricot will rot unplucked on their stems; that the grizzly bear, descending from his mountain home, will prey upon the unguarded flocks; and the people of the Pacific States, in the course of a year or two, in general mass meetings, will be pounding at the doors of this House, headed by an ex-Congressman of the name of PAGE, demanding in thunder-tones the repeal of this iniquitous, un-Christian, un-American, inhuman, and diabolical act. While that would be a most singular solution of this problem, I, for one, would be perfectly willing to send the gentlemen who indulge in these sad auguries as a deputation to the Golden Gate to welcome with eloquence and song and flowers and the roar of artillery and the blaze of bonfires the returning "heathen Chinese."

But to return from this digression. In my judgment, the only question at issue is the question of expediency. Is it expedient to suspend Chinese immigration, at the present juncture, in the manner proposed in the bill? And that brings me to the main proposition. What is the situation of affairs? Confronting California on the west, with the ocean between, lies the empire of China. It extends from east to west, from the Sea of Japan on the one side almost to the Caspian on the other, over seventy degrees of longitude, and from north to south over thirty-five degrees of latitude. It was old when Alexander stopped his victorious troops on the banks of the Ganges. Its

silks were exposed to sale in the luxurious cities of the Roman Empire when the Christian era began. Its civilization is pre-eminently marked by dogged conservatism. The Chinaman of twenty centuries ago is unquestionably the Chinaman of to-day. The operations of time, of climate, of foreign conquest, of emigration have made no visible impression upon his rooted national characteristics. He is original, immovable, and inveterate in the preservation of his race distinctions. He never amalgamates.

But what I desire to invite the attention of this House to is, not the antiquity of Chinese civilization, not the territorial magnitude of the Chinese Empire, not the variety of its physical geography, but to its redundant and enormous population. The official census taken in 1812 announced the population of China to be 360,000,000 souls. Nor is there the slightest warrant to impeach the accuracy of that census. Population in that vast empire multiplies with signal vigor, and if unholy methods were not employed to repress it it would speedily outgrow the means of subsistence. The population of China, according to the best estimates, is to-day 450,000,000 souls.

That overgrown population in a great empire, where the resources of subsistence are now pressed to the utmost, is peculiarly exposed to the vicissitudes of famine, of epidemic, of foreign war, of civil convulsion; for the internal repose of China has frequently been broken by civil strife, which has forced considerable bodies of the insurgents to seek refuge in the neighboring countries. Considering, therefore, China as it is, its overgrown population, its proximity to the Pacific States—for steam navigation has brought Canton nearer to San Francisco than Nashville was to Washington City in the administration of Andrew Jackson—I say considering China as it is, it is no exaggeration to declare that the Pacific States are liable at any moment to a numerous, and therefore dangerous, irruption of Mongolians. These dangers, it is true, are merely conjectural. But there is no occasion to venture on the domain of speculation, for the people of California are menaced by real dangers in the shape of the steady growth of Chinese immigration. Since 1854 over one hundred thousand adult Chinamen have established themselves on the Pacific coast. They come and go. The parent colony, however, constantly grows in size. Alien in manners, servile in labor, pagan in religion, they are fundamentally un-American.

Our civilization, which is the most potent in the world in blotting out race distinctions and amalgamating nationalities, is utterly powerless to efface in a single aspect the primeval national characteristics of the Chinaman. He is literally iron-clad to the genius of our institutions. He is the same unadulterated Mongolian on the banks of the Sacramento River as he is on the Hoang Ho. He is the same bigoted pagan, after twenty-five years' residence under the spires of San Francisco, as he is among the joss houses of Canton. He is the same unbending Asiatic, whether toiling on the Union Pacific or under the shadow of the great wall of China. His national characteristics, his physical life, his very vices, enable him to underbid and drive out white labor by unequal and injurious competition.

I will not stop to specify the inequality of this competition. It is sufficient to affirm, in general terms, that wherever Mongolian labor goes in sufficient force, there white labor inevitably succumbs. No other result is possible. In the light of these facts, I therefore assert that the Caucasians and the Mongolians cannot dwell together much longer in peace on the Pacific coast.

It has been asserted that the Pacific States would in the end become all Caucasian or all Mongolian. I believe that language has been ascribed to the late Senator Morton. I doubt very much whether he ever used it. If he did, it was a most inexplicable inadvertence. The man who declares on the floor of this House or on the floor of the Senate that the race in whose veins flows the blood of Cromwell, of Hampden, of Burke, of Washington, of Webster, of Lincoln will surrender the Pacific States to Mongolian ascendancy has studied the history of American people from a most fallacious stand-point.

This question is not the question of possible Mongolian ascendancy in the Pacific States. That is not the danger. It lies in another direction. For twelve years the people of California have remonstrated against the continuance of this evil. Year after year they have besieged this House with their petitions. Their conduct has been manly, and their patience most admirable.

The danger is, that if Congress should continue to disregard the just expostulations of the Pacific States, the headstrong element in those States, and there are headstrong elements in all communities, despairing of national succor, giving full rein to their passions, may undertake to redress their own grievances in their own way. I apprehend that is the real danger that impends over the future.

Race collisions are coeval with race diversities. The same causes that will provoke a breach of the peace in Massachusetts, or New York, or Connecticut, will provoke a breach of the peace in California, or Oregon, or Nevada. But such a solution of this difficulty would be discredit to the American people and a stain upon our national honor.

Now is the time to settle this question, and to settle it peaceably and fairly. To procrastinate its solution will only aggravate the evils that may surround it in the future, and possibly invite public dishonor, if not calamity. To trifle with an evil is simply to invigorate it.

Take polygamy as an example. Singular as it may appear, that

social distemper was propagated in the north temperate zone, where climate and public opinion are at war with the polygamous habit, by a man of New England origin. Pursuing substantially the forty-second degree of north latitude, driven out of New York, driven out of Ohio, driven out of Illinois, driven out of Missouri by local exasperation, Mormonism finally barricaded itself in the wilderness, and, by the national delinquency, was permitted to overspread and occupy a great Territory. And now to tear out by the roots this carnal monstrosity of the Sierra Nevadas, to overthrow this nasty aggregation of lascivious outlaws, and to manumit a great Territory from the iron grip of an audacious gang of sacerdotal libertines, requires the utmost exertion of the arm of the national power, backed by the angry protests of public opinion from all sections of the country.

So much for trifling with an evil. Yet the assertion will hardly be challenged that the dignity of white labor is in far greater danger in the Pacific States from Asiatic competition than the monogamic institution of the American people is from the practice of polygamy in Utah. Both are evils of great moment, and this House has done its part in striking down the one, and the nation expects it to do its part in settling the other.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that national valor is the firmest bulwark of national liberty. No people, ancient or modern, ever acquired, enjoyed, or defended constitutional liberty without being endowed in the highest degree with the virtue of martial courage. Cowardice and liberty are repugnant. Valor and democracy are inseparable. To be free is to be brave; and to be brave is, in the end, to be free.

The Chinese people are notoriously unwarlike. The fact that, in 1860, a mere handful of Europeans, in a battle under the walls of Peking, dispersed, almost without bloodshed, the military power of an empire of 450,000,000 inhabitants, warrants the use of a term of description far less urbane than that of unwarlike. But in animadverting on this capital and notorious vice of Chinese nationality, I desire to employ very soft language.

Suppose that we had 450,000,000 inhabitants in the United States, and in order to protect our northern frontier from the incursions of the Canadians we should build with incredible labor a stone wall from New Brunswick across the continent to Vancouver Island; suppose that in addition to this, in order to protect our southwestern frontier from the depredations of the Mexican greasers, we should build a stone wall from the Gulf of Mexico along the Rio Grande frontier up to El Paso; with such stupendous monuments of national pusillanimity, how long would constitutional government subsist in this country? If the northern people had been molded of such material, the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, in the late civil war, would have watered their cavalry horses in Lake Erie and bivouacked their infantry in the parks of New York City in about thirty days.

When the Roman people, under Marcus Antoninus, built a stone wall along the Dacian frontier to protect the empire from the irruptions of the Germans, they proclaimed the decay of their national valor as well as the degradation of their national character.

The immigrants who are pouring to our shores to-day, from western Europe and the British Isles, are the descendants of those fierce nations who broke through that Dacian barrier, forced the passage of the Rhine and the Danube, and overrun with invincible steps a sinking empire. These representatives of the great Teutonic, Celtic, and Scandinavian families come here to become American citizens in every sense of the word. Instead of corrupting, they enrich our blood. Instead of impoverishing, they corroborate our martial virtues. They renounce allegiance to all other governments and swear allegiance to the United States of America, and as a rule they keep their oaths.

Confessedly, great as is our capacity to absorb these kindred nationalities it is likely to be taxed to the utmost in the near future. The immigration to our shores from Europe during the last year approached the magnitude of an exodus. This incoming tide of population is more likely to augment than diminish in volume.

The condition of Europe; the gigantic military establishments kept up by European states in time of peace; the incessant wars they have waged and are likely to wage; the enormous debts they have piled up; the change in their monetary standard from gold and silver to gold alone, which has rendered the burden of these debts almost intolerable; the unhappy and restless condition of the Irish peasantry; these and other causes are likely to impel upon our shores in the near future growing masses of the European people.

Undoubtedly, we have a problem from that section, but that problem is easily solved, because the immigrants coming to us from that quarter become homogeneous with organic aptitude and prepossession.

But if you add to the problem on the Atlantic front the problem on the Pacific front, the problem of unrestricted Chinese immigration, of Mongolian invasion, (for it will in time amount to an invasion if not arrested,) you will complicate in a large degree the difficulties that may surround this country in the visible future.

The sound policy of this bill is maintainable on other grounds. The United States have already become a mighty power. Our territory is washed on the east and the west by two oceans, and extends from north to south, from Cleveland to New Orleans, over twelve hundred miles. Our population is now over fifty millions. The next Federal census may announce it to be seventy-five millions. Our pursuits are multifarious and our interests at times conflicting,

if not antagonistic. The ship-building States have a grievance, as has the whole country, in the decay of our commercial marine. That grievance should, if possible, be redressed. Massachusetts and Connecticut and New York and Pennsylvania and Ohio have an interest in the protection of our domestic manufactures not precisely reciprocated by Kansas and Nebraska and Iowa and Minnesota, yet we stand by a protective tariff, because it is advantageous to American labor. Louisiana has an interest in the production of sugar, and we protect the interests of Louisiana. Texas has an occasional grievance in the depredation of the cattle-thieves that infest the Mexican side of the Rio Grande. To redress her grievances and to protect her cattle from rapine, let the saber of our dragoons, if necessary, gleam along the whole Rio Grande front.

Our western Territories have grievances in the hostile operations of the Indians, a race of men who, from Pocahontas to Sitting Bull, have displayed the same national habits of perfidy, of cruelty, and of barbarism, and yet we protect our growing Territories by the Army and by the expenditure of national treasure. The whole people have a grievance in the existence of polygamy in Utah; therefore we tear it out by the roots. The people in the Mississippi Valley have an appalling and wide-spread grievance at the present time. The Mississippi River, swollen by the lawless floods of its numerous tributaries, rioting in the intemperance of unbridled power, sweeping over the puny restraints of man, has carried destruction along the wide pathway of its mad floods. I am a citizen of Ohio, and I might look upon that calamity as pertaining simply to the people of the Mississippi Valley. On the contrary, my heart goes out to those homeless families who huddle on the broken levees of that imperial but riotous stream. I applaud the most generous exertions of the national power in relieving their temporary distress, and hope to be able to applaud its wise superintendence in so bridling the Mississippi River, so circumscribing it to fixed boundaries as to limit, as far as it is in human power to limit, its opportunities to inflict calamity on the strong-armed and stout-hearted people who dwell in its magnificent basin.

The people of Nevada, of California, of Oregon, have a grievance in the continuance of Chinese immigration. They have demanded of this House year after year the redress of this grievance. Shall the people of New York or Massachusetts or Connecticut set themselves up in judgment upon the people of California and Nevada and Oregon and pronounce their grievances imaginary and untenable? Let their just complaint be answered, for it is by the prompt eradication of geographical evils such as the people of the Pacific States now complain of that the prosperity, the order, and the repose of all the States are subserved, the foundations of the Union strengthened, and the love of the American people drawn to the flag.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I insist that the Republican party is now committed, and has been committed since its organization, to the principal object of this bill—the preservation of the dignity and freedom of labor. It fought its first great battle in 1856 upon that issue; it stood by the same colors in 1860, when it elected Abraham Lincoln; it espoused the cause of Kansas when that "virgin Territory was being forced to the hateful embraces of slavery;" it made labor honorable all over this country; it wrote in golden letters upon the statute book a liberal homestead law; it protected American manufactures and American labor by wise tariff legislation. All along its line it has espoused the cause of labor. Shall it now turn its back upon its old battle-flag, upon its old war cries, upon its latest national platform, as mere clap-trap, and be recreant to its high trust? As a protectionist, as a Republican, I stand by the white labor of the Pacific States against the dishonorable competition of cool labor, and I can vote for this bill with a clear conscience. [Applause.]

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. BAYNE.]

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have very hastily gathered some thoughts upon this subject, not knowing until yesterday afternoon that I would have an opportunity to speak. For that opportunity I am indebted to the courtesy of my friend from Ohio [Mr. McCURE] who has just addressed the House.

It is well known that a bill to restrict Chinese immigration was passed by both Houses of the Forty-sixth Congress, but was vetoed by President Hayes on the ground that its provisions were in conflict with the then existing treaty between the Chinese Empire and the United States, and known as the Burlingame treaty. President Hayes recognized the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil, and the country is indebted to his administration for the negotiation of a treaty with China which authorizes Congress to regulate, limit, or suspend that immigration.

The bill under consideration is intended to carry into operation the provisions of the new treaty. If it becomes a law the importation of cool labor will be stopped after ninety days, and for the period of twenty years. The Chinese who are now in the United States, and those who may be accredited as diplomatic representatives of that government to the United States, and such Chinese as may come for mercantile purposes, or for the purpose of acquiring education, or to travel, will not be precluded from coming and consuming such objects.

The bill has evoked a discussion in both the Senate and the House which reflects great credit, in my judgment, upon both its friends

and its opponents. It presents no ordinary problem, and it is well, therefore, that there should be brought to bear upon its solution all the reasons which logic and experience can marshal.

The stand-points from which this measure is viewed by its supporters and opponents are largely and essentially different. The people, the institutions, and the territory of the United States are the elements which form the stand-point of the former; this entire planet is scarcely sufficient to form the stand-point of the latter. It is but natural that widely varying conclusions should be reached by processes quite logical from postulates so entirely unlike. Those who oppose this bill argue that our bill of rights has fastened upon our country and its institutions the duty of receiving and affording asylum for all people who may choose to come to it. By coupling with this hypothesis the theory of the universal brotherhood of man, a convenient way is at once found to the conclusion that the bill should be defeated.

These are, concisely stated, the materials out of which the whole warp and woof of the arguments against this bill are woven. The sentimental colorings, so neatly depicted by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] may please those with æsthetic predilections, like the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MORSE,] but they will fail to attract the admiration of those who look into the philosophy of things for the course that it is wisest to pursue. Eloquent allusions to our national traditions may captivate those who look to the past for their inspiration, but they will have but little influence on those who are compelled to deal with the stern realities of the present, which is the lot of the great masses of the people.

But are our national traditions, our bill of rights, our system of government, antagonistic to the exclusion of the Chinese? Does the bill before us violate these principles? I think it does not. When this continent was first settled, and during the whole period of its history from that time until about twenty-five years ago, it was never dreamed that the people of Asia would be likely to immigrate into it. It was perfectly known that the people of Europe had come, were coming, and would come. Now, constitutions and laws are construed in the light of the circumstances which surrounded them at the time of their formation. They are the products of their environment, and it is an invariable rule of construction that they were made with reference to that environment. The history of our country shows that there were three kinds of people here when the Constitution and the first set of laws enacted thereunder were formed, white people, native-born, and of different European nationalities; Africans, who were mostly held as slaves, and the aborigines or Indians.

Now, the best denotation of the theory of our Government as to who should and who should not become a part of the body-politic is the naturalization laws. These laws extended an invitation to all who could take the benefit of them to come to the United States and make it their home. By parity of reason they did not welcome those whom they excluded from such privileges. The laws passed in 1802, 1804, 1816, and 1824, are still in force and unchanged, excepting as I shall hereafter point out, and under them none but free white persons could become citizens of the United States. In 1870, after the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution had been ratified, they were extended to "aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent." This just atonement for the crime of human slavery was a fitting sequel to the preservation of our national unity.

Now, sir, at no time from the beginning of our Government to the present could a Mongolian become a citizen of the United States. When the traditions we speak of were supposed to be active principles the Constitution and laws I have spoken of were formed, and the courts have decided that the laws enacted in pursuance of that Constitution do not admit the Mongolian to citizenship. The fact is that the opponents of this measure have deduced most of their conclusions from the beautiful aureole which envelops our Goddess of Liberty, and seem unwilling to heed her oracles, which are plainly enough written in the Constitution and the laws.

Now, what is the other aspect of this controversy? Having come down from the cerulean heights where the opponents of this measure delight to linger, let us examine the problem from a practical, concrete, common-sense, yes, and a philosophical point of view.

The people of the United States are intelligent, industrious, and generous. They have a splendid domain, a vast accumulation of wealth, and an excellent system of government. They are organized into a nation of unrivaled capacity and power. Their interests are mutual and interdependent, and the general prosperity and happiness are the combined resultants of the individual efforts which they make in the struggle for existence. In no other country of the world is the effort to be and to do beset with fewer difficulties or attended with greater triumphs. Their civilization is marvelously progressive. They are not selfish. They invite and welcome those who will come and assimilate with them; those who flee from oppression and seek freedom; those, in a word, who desire to become good citizens.

The people of the United States, fortunately and necessarily, follow a great variety of occupations. The wise and judicious enforcement of protection by the Government has stimulated and encouraged all kinds of industry. The people are nearly all workmen. The farmers, manufacturers, merchants, professional men, producers, and the skilled and unskilled workingmen, with their wives and children, form the great bulk of the population. The distribution of labor is, on the whole, equal and just, and no class has the power

to impose upon any other class. Intellectual and moral culture is attainable and, I may say, is attained by every boy and girl in the land. In a word, the civilization of the United States is highly developed, and every year and every day is adding potency to the forces that are promoting that development.

"With such power, and such resources, and such capacity, what reason have we to fear the Chinese or anybody else?" say the opponents of this bill. I reply, "Disease will kill the strongest man." The social organism is no more exempt from the attacks of disease than the individual organism. The healthful activity of the social functions is just as essential to the well-being of a people as is the natural activity of the functions of a man to his health and comfort. The law of the distribution of the labor of a society regulates and controls the social functions of that society, and the adaptation of the parts to each other and the harmonious working of the entire system are not the result of sudden causes, but they are the result of long, long years of slow growth. Now, whatever affects injuriously any one of these functions hurts the entire society. By that test let us judge the coming and the doings of the Chinese. In the able speech of Senator MILLER, of California, I find the following:

The more intelligent Chinese, who had learned the art and business in which they had been employed, began a co-operative system of Chinese manufacture, and numerous factories sprung up, carried on wholly by Chinese in competition with their old employers. Chinese proprietors imported laborers from China, who came under contracts for a term of years, as they all come, and worked out their passage money at the wages paid in China, \$3 or \$4 per month. For example, I will cite the manufacture of boots and shoes. The number of boot and shoe factories now in San Francisco is sixty. The number carried on by white proprietors is twelve. The number carried on by Chinese is forty-eight. The number of slipper factories is fifty, all carried on by Chinese. The number of Chinese employed in making boots, shoes, &c., is 5,700; number of white people so employed is 1,100.

After a brief colloquy with Senator HOAR, he says:

The statistics of the manufacture of cigars in San Francisco are still more suggestive. This business was formerly carried on exclusively by white people, many hundreds finding steady and lucrative employment in that trade. I have here the certified statement from the office of the collector of internal revenue at San Francisco, showing the number of white people and Chinese, relatively, employed on the 1st of November last in the manufacture of cigars. The statement is as follows:

Number of white men employed.....	493
Number of white women employed.....	170
Total whites.....	663
Number of Chinese employed.....	5,182

The facts of this statement were carefully ascertained by three deputy collectors. The San Francisco Assembly of Trades certify that there are 8,265 Chinese employed in laundries. It is a well-known fact that white women who formerly did this work have been quite driven out of that employment. The same authority certifies that the number of Chinese now employed in the manufacture of clothing in San Francisco is 7,510, and the number of whites so employed is 1,000. In many industries the Chinese have entirely supplanted the white laborers, and thousands of our white people have quit California and sought immunity from this grinding competition in other and better-favored regions.

These facts show that the Chinese in San Francisco have almost wholly supplanted our own people in certain classes of skilled and unskilled work and manufactures. They have appropriated mostly the occupations which can least endure severe competition. They drive out the poor women as well as the strong men. They can subsist on less than one-half of what our people must have to live. It is said that it does not cost a Chinaman more than eight or ten cents a day to live.

Now, who will contend that such disturbances of our economic conditions are not a social malady? Who will argue that driving our own people out of their occupations and their homes is not the destruction of social functions which the law of the distribution of labor had matured? Who will assert that the presence of such a conflict is not a constant menace to the peace and happiness of our people?

There are phases of the moral degradation of the Chinese which are too revolting to describe. The temptations which they place in the way of our youth, and the dreadful consequences that too frequently ensue, may not be spoken here. Not recognizing the marriage relation, having but little if any regard for the obligations of an oath, indifferent to all things except the accumulation of money, persistent in debased habits and modes of life, their influence on our civilization would only tend to its corruption and decay.

The population of China is variously estimated at from 350,000,000 to 450,000,000. There are now in the United States about 125,000, about 75,000 of whom are in California. With what disfavor and apprehension they are regarded by the people of California may be deduced from the vote of the people of that State in 1879, when the question of Chinese immigration was submitted to the people. The vote was 883 for, and 154,638 against this immigration. A similar vote was taken in Nevada with the result of 183 for, and 17,250 against this immigration.

Now, to my mind these votes are very significant. The people of California and Nevada are as good and patriotic as the people of the other States of the Union. They have churches, school-houses, libraries, and newspapers, and there is no reason, it seems to me, why their judgment should not be considered just. I must think that they have a better right to say what ought to be done than the people of any other State, because they are the sufferers. It seems to me to be little short of presumption for those who have no cause of complaint against the Chinese because they are not brought into contact with them, to say to the people of the Pacific States "You must endure this evil

whether you like it or not." Gentlemen, put yourselves in the place of the people of California, and then arrive at a conclusion as to what ought to be done. Some of the gentlemen who oppose this measure have ungenerously intimated that if the Chinese had votes no such measure would be pressed. It is scarcely fair to impugn the motives of those who favor this bill, who live thousands of miles away, and whom the votes of the Chinese could in no way affect. It is a bad and an irritating cause which requires such advocacy, and I venture to say that the judgments of the advocates are not wholly free from doubt as to the tenability of their position. I might retort, too, if I were so inclined, that if these same gentlemen had to work in California at \$30, or \$40, or \$50 per month, instead of \$5,000 a year and mileage in the city of Washington, they would not be so devoted to the opinions they now have.

The dignity of American labor, that great source of our wealth, must be vigilantly guarded against all attacks. The purity of our civilization must be preserved. The welfare and happiness of our own people should never be lost sight of. These objects will be promoted by this bill. I think it will pass and become a law. If it fail, or if, after the lapse of ten or twenty years it shall not be revived, the wisdom of those who favor it now and of those who may seek to revive it will not be doubted by the generations that will follow.

In every land where the Chinese have gained a foothold they have ultimately conquered it, not by the force of arms, but by the insidious methods of supplanting the people whose domain they have invaded. Four hundred millions of people are a dangerous rival. He is a wise man who will not overlook this fact.

Believing that this is a just and necessary measure, and that it is consistent with the treaty, I shall vote for it as it is.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. No. 650) to authorize the Secretary of War to release a right of way across the lands of the United States at Plattsburgh, New York.

Also, that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the House of the following titles, in which amendments the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested, namely:

A bill (H. R. No. 4222) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. No. 4439) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States establishing the times, places, and provisions for holding terms of the district and circuit courts in the northern district of New York.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SCRANTON. It has not been my intention to ask a hearing upon this subject, already so ably and thoroughly debated. I am, however, in receipt of a request from the workmen of my district to express their opposition to Chinese immigration and their sympathy with brother workmen on the Pacific slope. At a convention of representatives of operatives from the collieries in my district, held at Pittston on Saturday, their views were expressed in the following telegram:

PITSTON, PENNSYLVANIA, March 18.

We, the representatives of the miners and laborers of the Luzerne and Lackawanna coal regions of Pennsylvania, assembled at Pittston this 18th day of March, 1882, do resolve that we heartily co-operate with our brother workmen on the Pacific slope in restricting the immigration of Chinese labor to our shores, and as constituents of Hon. J. A. SCRANTON, we respectfully ask that he express the same as being the sense of the people of these coal fields.

P. MOONEY,

Chairman Committee on Resolutions.

Hon. JOSEPH A. SCRANTON,  
House of Representatives, Washington.

The body sending this message represents 30,000 workmen, two-thirds of whom toil in peril and darkness underground. They produce one-third of the entire anthracite coal tonnage in this country, and I bear their message to you for consideration and in evidence that the eye of labor all over the land is upon our deliberations and scrutinizing our acts.

Mr. Speaker, the district from which I come is distinctively a labor district, the great industrial center of Northeastern Pennsylvania, and from one end of it to the other is almost a continuous line of collieries, with furnaces, forges, foundries, and mills ablaze in iron and steel manufacture. These miners, mine laborers, mill hands, mechanics, and all classes of daily toilers at manual labor are a thrifty, intelligent, law-abiding, patriotic people. They advocate and uphold the rights and dignity of labor and are tenacious and jealous of its power and prerogatives. They believe in the American system of protection, and look to Congress to stand between them and the pauper labor of Europe. Claiming protection for their own labor, they are consistent in demanding the same privilege for that of their fellows less favorably situated. Their brotherhood girdles the continent and their sympathies are with their fellow-man upon the Pacific slope. They believe America is for the Caucasian race, and accepting the results of the rebellion recognize the African as a co-laborer and citizen. Not so with the Mongolian; for him they have no affiliation nor welcome, and I but voice their sentiments in these expressions and would illy represent them did I not embrace this opportunity to vote against unrestricted Chinese immigration.

But, Mr. Speaker, while I propose to support the bill under consideration, I shall vote for it more cheerfully if the period of its limitation is reduced from twenty to ten years. With a majority of the Republican membership, if not indeed of that of the whole House, I appeal to the gentleman in charge of the measure [Mr. PAGE] to make this concession to our convictions of honest dealing, justice, and national faith, under existing treaties with China. I appeal for this amendment to the managers of this bill as a Republican desirous of preserving and fulfilling the traditions and tenets of the Republican party, and of exemplifying our faithful adherence to the Chinese plank in the National Republican platform of 1880.

The treaty ratified last year with the Empire of China empowers the United States to "regulate, limit, or suspend" Chinese immigration, but not to "absolutely prohibit it." I quote further: "The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable, and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations." I submit, sir, that a period of twenty years in this connection is not a reasonable time, and if enacted as a law will entail upon us as a people, not only the stigma of broken faith, but will subject us to retaliation disastrous in its consequences to our commercial interests, a matter of considerable importance, not to mention an estoppel to all American effort for the evangelization of that benighted pagan empire.

Twenty years, sir, is the epoch of a generation. It is equivalent to abrogation of the treaty not yet a year old. Twenty years may not be too long for our national welfare to close our ports against Mongolian pauper labor; half a century, one hundred years, forever, may ultimately become our wisest policy. Let us leave this part of the problem to the future, and for the present fix a single decade for the trial. Thus, while giving the Pacific slope the relief it needs and which all are ready to grant, still keep within reasonable bounds of our recent compact with the Celestial Empire. Other modifications are suggested, but this single one will, I am confident, bring to this bill a support equal to that given the anti-polygamy act last week.

This is not an age of sentiment, but of practical, common-sense utilitarianism. In staying Chinese immigration for, say, the next ten years, we but avail ourselves of terms to which China has consented, and may still expect our trade with that empire to continue and increase. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1881, it reached nearly \$28,000,000, having doubled since the adoption of the Burlingame treaty thirteen years ago. Let the Chinese go, if you will, but let them go decently and in order, as becomes the great nation we claim to be. Let the Chinese go, but let us preserve our plighted faith inviolate before the nations of the earth. This is not only right, it is wise policy. By any other course we not only degrade ourselves in the eyes of the world, but are false to our consciences and blind to our commercial interests, for by such action we shall forfeit to England, France, and other commercial nations the valuable trade which years of persistent effort have opened to us in China. Let the bill be amended to ten years, and thus avoid any protests for violation of the spirit of the treaty.

In pre-Abrahamic time, during the reign of Nimrod, the mighty conqueror, "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech." In the land of Shinar (Babylonia) was undertaken the building of a tower, "whose top may reach unto heaven." The Lord sent upon them confusion of tongues, and scattered them abroad upon the face of the earth. What shall be the future of America when assimilation of all races, colors, and creeds upon the globe is expected within her borders? Shall we continue a free, Christian republic, the dawn of millenium; or shall we sink into a second Babel!

#### A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, his Secretary, who also announced to the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. No. 1514) appropriating \$100,000 for continuing the work on Davis Island dam; and

A bill (H. R. No. 4283) for the relief of Susan Marshall Massie.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to address the House in forgetfulness of the fact that the question under consideration has been presented in almost if not quite every light in which it is capable of being presented. All the facts have been collated and every view presented that those facts suggested. In the kaleidoscope we constantly view the same particles and colors, yet at each turn they present a different form and arrangement, thus producing new impressions. So I may in my presentation of facts in connection with this question so arrange them as to call into existence new impressions and new thoughts.

I am not entirely clear that the title of this bill correctly describes its purpose. While favoring the bill most earnestly, at least in its purposes and ultimate objects, I am yet inclined to believe that it ought not to be described as a bill to carry out and into effect certain treaty stipulations with the Chinese. The provisions of this bill are rather permitted by the treaty stipulation than enjoined by its terms.

BILL AND TREATY STIPULATIONS SHOULD BE WELL CONSIDERED.

I desire the House to consider well whether the bill is in its terms

obnoxious to the stipulations of the treaty between our Government and the Government of China. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any one here will seriously question that this Republic, of all the nations, can least afford to violate even the spirit of a solemn compact made with another nation, because this is a Government of the people, and we have appealed to the whole world to judge us and our institutions according to our bearing in the matter of adherence to right principles in the discharge of every public and private duty. And whatever might be tolerated in another nation the strength, prosperity, and endurance of which does not, as in our own, depend upon the integrity, the intelligence, and virtue of the people, it is clear to my mind that this nation cannot afford to do that which looks even in the direction of the violation of any single treaty obligation.

I am persuaded, sir, that the clause of this bill which provides for the suspension of Chinese immigration for a period of twenty years goes certainly to the farthest limit of the letter of the treaty, and I greatly fear something beyond its spirit; and hence I would vote for a reduction of the term of years during which the suspension of this immigration may be enforced. For I submit, looking at it as a lawyer and from a legal stand-point, that the clause of the bill which suspends the immigration for twenty years is in fact and result a prohibition, and therefore is obnoxious to the clause of the treaty which provides that the immigration shall not be wholly prohibited. And I submit to my friends from the Pacific coast who are with spirit and energy urging the passage of the bill in the ultimate purpose of which they are so deeply interested that the modification proposed will not militate against the successful accomplishment of the results sought to be attained by its provisions, and I therefore hope they will agree to the modification proposed, so that it may conform clearly to the letter and spirit of our treaty stipulations.

#### A NEW DEPARTURE IN OUR POLICY.

The consideration of this bill, Mr. Speaker, has claimed the attention of the House for some time, and well it might, for the world is looking on. This is a new departure for the young Republic. This bill seeks to assert a right the existence of which is denied by honorable gentlemen upon this floor. It seeks to recognize a principle the soundness of which is seriously questioned by gentlemen whose judgment is entitled to credit and respect. It seeks to inaugurate a policy which is different from anything we have known in the history of our country. The wisdom of inaugurating such a policy is also seriously doubted by honorable gentlemen upon this floor, gentlemen whose patriotism, learning, and thorough devotion to the right cannot be questioned.

#### IMMIGRATION OF CHINESE LABORERS BALEFUL.

I have already adverted to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment this bill does, in effect, violate, in one respect at least, the spirit of the treaty between this Government and China, and hence it requires, as I have suggested, some modifications of that provision. I desire, however, to go to the uttermost limit to which we may go, but still keeping within the spirit of that treaty, to the accomplishment of what is sought by this measure, *i. e.*, the prevention of immigration to the United States of those persons who are denominated in this bill as Chinese laborers. And I say this in the firm conviction that that immigration and the presence of these people among us is baleful in the highest degree. Now, is it baleful; is it injurious; is it degrading; or is it an element we might properly desire to welcome to our midst? Is it an element we would seek to introduce into our moral, social, and political organism for any purpose?

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the question, is this influence baleful, is it injurious to our moral, our social, our political well-being? I do not propose to examine all the testimony submitted to this House and to the country to establish that it is baleful and damaging in its influence and effect, and that in an eminent degree. I will call as witnesses the intelligent population of California, and they have borne their testimony fully and clearly and unmistakably in this behalf. What is the testimony of California? When the question was submitted to that people whether in point of fact the influence of the immigration sought to be suspended was baleful, whether it should be done away with, what was the response? One hundred and fifty-four thousand voters of that State answered in the affirmative. There were 883 who possibly entertained a contrary opinion. In Nevada there were 17,259 voters who asserted by voice and vote the influence of the Chinese laborers among us was injurious to our moral, social, and political well-being. There were 183 persons in Nevada who thought otherwise.

#### FEELING AGAINST CHINESE IMMIGRATION NOT MERELY RACE PREJUDICE.

Now, it cannot be said 171,259 in those two States acted merely from race prejudice, such as that described by my honorable colleague from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR.] Very far from it. They have a secret ballot there. There was nothing to restrain the philanthropy of which my friend speaks. There was nothing to prevent the assertion of that Christianity which he says actuates him in his opposition to this bill. No one was constrained by force of public opinion to disregard his honest convictions. Each citizen could vote his sentiments without restraint, for the ballot was secret. They did not vote *viva voce*. The judgment of that people, expressed as indicated, was that the presence of these immigrants in its influence was at war with the well-being of the people of this country, and that it is an influ-

ence that should not be increased or extended, but should be destroyed, in the interest of our free institutions, and those entitled to the protection they were intended to afford.

Now, if I could examine carefully and critically the 1,066 voters of the Pacific coast who are impressed with the idea that Chinese immigration is in itself a desirable and delectable thing, I suspect I would find among them gentlemen not prompted in their action by the philanthropic motives and the spirit of Christianity which inspired the utterances of certain gentlemen upon this floor in opposition to this bill. I apprehend I would find among them many who were making money out of the bone and muscle of this servile race and who were not specially enlisted in the cause of Christianity, whose lives were not wholly dedicated to that enlarged philanthropy which seeks the good of all, but who were interested rather in the shekels they could coin out of the labor of these heathen toilers. It is not impossible, Mr. Speaker, I might find among them also a few, a very few, of those philanthropists who are philanthropists in the abstract, whose philanthropy is of that kind which neglects struggling humanity at home and reaches across an ocean to find proper subjects of its care.

#### THE ENTIRE PEOPLE OF THE PACIFIC COAST PROTEST AGAINST IT.

I have little patience with that kind of Christianity which leaves a struggling and neglected mass of our own countrymen at home and searches in far-off India and China for fields of labor and deserving objects for its solicitude and care. But the testimony of men who speak from their own careful observation and long experience in California, Nevada, and the western slope where these people abound, and not from the inspiration merely of a devotion to philanthropy in the abstract, men who speak from full and ample personal knowledge of the effects of contact with these immigrants upon our social, political, and moral organisms, testify unanimously that this influence is degraded and degrading and that the hoped-for good to the Chinese is small compared to the evil resulting to our own people, the free, independent laborers of the western coast.

#### BOTH THE GREAT POLITICAL PARTIES ARE COMMITTED TO THE OBJECT AND PURPOSE OF THIS BILL.

What else? We are not confined to this testimony at all. The Democratic party, through its delegates, in national convention assembled in 1880, prompted by what motive you please, voicing Democratic thought and purpose, declared this influence corrupt and corrupting and that the Chinese should not have lot or part among us. Beyond that the Republican convention at Chicago, the same year, adopted a resolution in spirit sanctioning the purposes of the bill now under consideration, in these words—it has already been read in your presence, but I will read it again:

Since the authority to regulate immigration and intercourse between the United States and foreign nations rest with Congress, or with the United States and its treaty-making power, the Republican party, regarding the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invokes the exercise of these powers to restrain and limit the immigration by the enactment of such just, humane, and reasonable provisions as will produce that result.

Here is the solemn declaration of the great Republican party confirming the testimony of California, Nevada, and the Pacific coast, and enjoining upon Congress the duty of providing by law to mitigate and do away with the evil; and we are to-day responding to that instruction.

#### JAMES A. GARFIELD CHAMPIONED THE PRINCIPLES OF THIS MEASURE.

And beyond that James A. Garfield, voicing the best thoughts of his party and of his time, voicing the humanity of the country, voicing the convictions of its religious people, voicing the practical philanthropy of the nation, declared in regard to this immigration, in language too plain to be mistaken, and under conditions which places its import beyond doubt, that it was evil, and an evil that should not be tolerated among us. And you will bear me witness that there was but one response to his utterance, and that was that James A. Garfield was right.

Mr. MORSE. Then he dodged the issue after all.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. My friend is mistaken. James A. Garfield did not know how to dodge any issue, nor how to shirk any responsibility, and I will show you in a moment that six years before he entertained similar sentiments.

Mr. MORSE. The record shows he did not vote for the previous anti-Chinese bill.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH, (to Mr. MORSE.) My dear friend, of course it did not occur to you with your political convictions and associations that it was possible for any man to be controlled in his vote by a scrupulous regard for the stipulations of a treaty between his own country and another nation. I do not wonder, sir, that the gentleman is unable to understand why James A. Garfield refused to vote for a bill the provisions of which violated a solemn compact between his own country and another. Possibly he belongs to a party that are strangers to the observance of the obligation of solemn compacts. But here is what James A. Garfield said in his letter accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency:

The material interests of this country, the traditions of its settlement, and the sentiment of our people have led the Government to offer the widest hospitality to immigrants who seek our shores for new and happier homes, willing to share the burdens as well as the benefits of our society, and intending that their posterity shall become an undistinguishable part of our population. The recent movement of the Chinese to our Pacific coast partakes but little of the qualities of such immigration, either in its purposes or its results. It is too much like an importation of

be welcomed without restriction; too much like an invasion to be looked upon without solicitude. We cannot consent to allow any form of servile labor to be introduced among us under the guise of immigration. Recognizing the gravity of this subject the present administration, supported by Congress, has sent to China a commission of distinguished citizens for the purpose of securing such a modification of the existing treaty as will prevent the evils likely to arise from the present situation. It is confidently believed that these diplomatic negotiations will be successful without the loss of commercial intercourse between the two powers, which promises a great increase of reciprocal trade and the enlargement of our markets.

And he also said, and here we have his judgment as to whether Chinese immigration is an evil or not, whether its influences are evil or not:

Should these efforts fail it will be the duty of Congress to mitigate the evils already felt and prevent their increase by such restrictions as without violence or injustice will place upon a sure foundation the peace of our communities and the freedom and dignity of labor.

Now my friend says that James A. Garfield dodged the vote upon this question. I shall refer to that further along. But, voicing the sentiment of fifty millions of people, he expressed the opinion that it was the duty of this Congress to provide for mitigating and doing away with this evil influence. Such was his judgment, and such is the deliberate judgment expressed in conventions and by votes at the polls of the people of this country.

#### BILL CONSISTANT WITH PRACTICAL PHILANTHROPY AND CHRISTIANITY.

We are told by certain gentlemen upon this floor, gentlemen who assume to be the sons of Levi and to be priests unto us to guide us in the way of truth and righteousness—we are told by them that the provisions of this bill are against the spirit of our free institutions; that they are at war with true philanthropy; that they are at war with the spirit of the age; that they are at war with our Christian civilization. Is that so? I want to say to this House that never down to this hour have I been prompted to lift my voice or cast my vote for any measure that would deny to any human being the rights and privileges and immunities before the law which I claim for myself and for my children. And yet I give my heart and my vote to this measure, believing as I do that it is in the cause of true philanthropy, that it is in the cause and interest of free institutions, that it is in the interest of a practical Christianity, though possibly not consonant with that impractical Christianity which looks to the end but does not consider wisely of the means to that end. It may not be consonant with the ideas of those Christians who would build altars, but would not protect them nor the votaries who worship. It is consonant with that Christianity which is practical in its purposes and means, and which would not permit its advocates to stand idly by while the civil institutions which must be its shield and protection are overthrown by having the sources of their strength and excellence corrupted and destroyed.

There is such a thing as impractical Christianity, or rather, impracticable Christians; men who deal with ideal rather than existing conditions. Doubtless it is our mission on earth to make free and to civilize and Christianize the world. But I hope we will not commit suicide in the attempt. I hope it may not be written on the tomb of this Republic, "Here rests a brave and generous people who lost their own liberties in attempting to give freedom to all the world."

#### THE MORAL, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL WELL-BEING OF OUR OWN PEOPLE TO BE FIRST CONSIDERED.

As a question of abstract right may we restrict this immigration? Why sir, we may if we please quarantine against leprosy. We may stop the leper at our shore and send him from whence he came. Is it possible that the leprosy which whitens the skin may be guarded against and that which is worse, the leprosy of the heart, may not be turned away from us? Better a thousand immigrants whose skins are white as Miriam's with leprosy, than one hundred whose moral natures are rotted with disease.

I agree with my honorable colleague from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] or rather let me say I know as little as he does what part of God's great ocean these people may of right sail upon. I do not know or affect to know. But I think, in defense of ourselves, we may safely insist that wherever the Chinaman sails he must sail in his own boat, particularly if there is not room enough in ours to admit him with safety to our own people.

We are cited to the fact that it was said upon the mount: "Of one blood hath He created all the nations of the earth." So it is; and it is said as well: "and He fixed the bounds of their habitations." And I beg to insist, at least, that we shall observe the bounds fixed for the habitations of those people, so far as our own well-being requires it.

It is said that in advocating this bill we war against Christianity. I admit that we seem at least to deny to those people the rights and privileges which we claim for ourselves and children. Have we a right to do so if our own proper protection requires it? It is an important question. It is important to ourselves and important to our children that this be rightly decided. And, speaking upon a question of such importance, I sometimes feel as if I would desire to have it whispered in my ear, as it was in the ear of one of old: "And I will be with thee, and with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say."

#### CHINESE WILL NOT AND CANNOT ASSIMILATE WITH US.

I oppose the immigration of a class whose presence is inimical to the healthful growth of our institutions, whose presence wars against

our system of Christianity, whose manners, customs, beliefs, and practices war against our system of government, tending as they do to taint and corrupt the supports which uphold that Government. That these people do not assimilate is certain; that they could not is equally clear to my mind. My honored colleague says our laws forbid it. No, sir; they cannot assimilate with us, not because of any law traced upon our statute-book, but because of a law traced by the finger of the Deity, a law which this House cannot repeal nor provide against. Why, sir, in thirty years among us, there is not an approach to assimilation. What of your statutes? Could your statutes prevent assimilation with the Irish people, with the Scotch people, with the French, with the English, with the Germans, with the Poles, with the Scandinavians? No, sir; you could not. Even though you forbid it by law, and even though you put shackles upon their limbs, still would they not only be with us but of us. We are the children of their loins; we are their brethren; they are of our civilization, of our Christianity, nay, they are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and assimilation would take place in spite of any law upon our statute-book, for it is in the order and fitness of things.

#### HEALTHFUL COOLY ASSIMILATION OUT OF THE QUESTION.

But the testimony in regard to the Chinese is that they do not assimilate with us because it is not in their nature. They have those peculiar properties and characteristics intensified by being transmitted through forty centuries, from father to son and from mother to her offspring, which render assimilation impossible. These peculiarities are largely the result of the Chinese observing the maxims of Confucius, to walk in trodden paths, until their very natures, their instincts, and all their feelings are as widely different from our own as it is possible to conceive of, and so widely and radically different as to render healthful assimilation out of the question. There might be degrading amalgamation, but no elevating and ennobling assimilation. And so far as the statute is concerned, you might as well hope to compel by law the assimilation of oil and water. We all know as a matter of fact and of logic and philosophy that we cannot combine and unite with a lower race of people without lowering the average of our own social, physical, and moral being. Is there any doubt about that? Not the slightest; it is not in logic that there can be any doubt about it. We find it impossible to lift them wholly up to us, stripping them of those qualities of mind and morals which are baleful. We must, if we meet at all, find that point of meeting somewhere between the level of our own condition and that of theirs.

The object, the purpose of this bill is not to limit the field of philanthropic labor, but to maintain a basis from which to labor and to protect the fruits of such labor to our country and to our children. The practical Christian will not find his opportunities to do good abridged by this bill, but he will feel that the results of his efforts are protected and his means of usefulness increased.

My honorable friend may say that these people thrive in our midst by their industry.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman allow me to answer his question?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. No; for you would be sure to make a speech.

Mr. CANDLER. I will not; I will only answer your question.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CANDLER. You said substantially that we could not have relations with a race below us without sinking down to its standard. The whole history of Christian civilization is that we lift up the downtrodden and ignorant and elevate the barbarian to our standard.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. That does not disprove my proposition, or show that my statement is incorrect. The question here is as to giving Christianity an opportunity to assert itself in accomplishing what my friend suggests. The history of the world proves no such thing as the gentleman asserts, in practical results. The history of the world does prove that when you combine one race elevated, enlightened, and refined, with another which is degraded and depraved, the general average, as to morals, manners, social and moral qualities in the new combination, is below the average of the superior race which forms a factor of the combination of the two races, and that therefore a combination or amalgamation of such elements is not a desirable means of building up the cause of Christianity.

#### PROTECTION AGAINST CONTACT AND COMPETITION WITH SERVILE LABOR.

But the purpose sought by this bill is not to degrade any one; it is to protect our own people from the influence and contact of servile labor; from contact of men without ambition, without an end or aim beyond securing sufficient means to live after the manner of their ancestors in China. Wholly lacking in the elements which are characteristic of our own people; and of a purer and more ennobling system of civilization, and association with whom is calculated to degrade those of our race.

And not only do we seek to prevent that association, but beyond that, as my honorable friend from California [Mr. PAGE] has said, we seek to prevent our own free, independent laborers from being brought into competition with servile labor. And it is known of all men that this has been the mission of the Republican party on the earth—to dignify labor and to ennoble and elevate the laborer. Whether it has been any part of the mission of another great party,

possibly we need not inquire too zealously. The record of that other party is made up. I need not stop now to search it. It is said that this bill is in the special interest of the Irish people of San Francisco and of the Pacific coast. So be it, if you will. It is said that it is in the interest of the German laborer of that coast. So be it, if you will. I insist that it is in the interest of the free and independent laborers of this country everywhere, and I am not disturbed if its provisions shall especially bless that class of our yeomanry who have contributed so largely to the material, the moral, and the intellectual growth of our country as the classes mentioned have done.

#### DEMOCRATIC PARTY ON COMPETITION OF FREE WITH SERVILE LABOR.

Now, so far as our Democratic brethren are concerned, they are under no obligation, by reason of their creed or practice in regard to labor, to vote for this bill. And I will say to our Irish friends, who form the bone and sinew of that party, and are by its leaders regarded as their voting machinery, so to speak, that I am not aware that they are under any special obligations to the Democratic party for this somewhat spasmodic effort to relieve them from the influence of servile labor. It is within the memory of even our boys here that that party was quite satisfied to have the Irish, the German, the Scandinavian laborer work in the fields of Kansas side by side, and in the furrows of her soil, with wretches brought from the shambles, and upon whose limbs were shackles and manacles. The whole voice and vote of that party was to have it so. I am glad that they have come to realize the importance of freeing the laborers of this country from contact with servile labor.

#### REPUBLICAN PARTY ON PROTECTION FROM CONTACT AND COMPETITION WITH SERVILE LABOR.

Another thing, the Republican party, as I have said, are bound to carry out the spirit at least of the provisions of this bill, and to protect our own people from the degrading influences of servile labor and also to remove from them the unjust and degrading competition which that labor produces. Nay, Mr. Speaker, we of the Republican party are not only in favor of protecting American laborers from the unjust competition of Chinese labor in California, but we favor affording that protection, whether the servile or pauper laborer works in California or in Cuba, or elsewhere on the earth. So far as competition with such labor is concerned it is a matter of no consequence to the laborers of this country whether the articles produced by such labor be put upon our markets from shops in California or Canada or Cuba, the effect being the same in the absence of protective legislation and in the presence and under the influence of democratic free trade.

#### MORE DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE ON COMPETITION WITH SERVILE AND PAUPER LABOR.

Our Democratic brethren differ from us in this: if the competition is removed from the shops in San Francisco to shops in Canada they are quite content, although the effect on the interest of the laborer here is precisely the same. In fact, the freight from Canada being less than from the Pacific coast, the competition in the Canada shops would be more destructive than if it was confined to the shops on the Pacific coast. Suppose millions of Chinese should locate along your Canada border and in the neighboring island of Cuba and the islands adjacent, and open their shops there, manufacture their cigars and their shoes, &c., living on rice and turning out the product of their shops cheaply and flooding our markets with so-called cheap goods, and thus empty our own factories and force our mechanics into idleness, thus taking the bread out of the mouths of our own laborers and their children, what would our Democratic friends say to that kind of competition? It is not in their creed or their practice to protect the American laborer from that kind of competition. They protect him only when his competitor works within the domain of our Republic. We protect the American laborer when he is brought in unjust competition with degraded, servile, or pauper labor, wherever on the earth it may be, whether in San Francisco, Montreal, Cuba, Quebec, or Canton. And this marks the distinction in this behalf between the two great political parties.

#### FREE AND SERVILE LABOR INCOMPATIBLE.

It has been said on this floor that if these men were clothed with the ballot there would be no voice lifted against them. That is a great, a grievous mistake. For one I should lift my voice very promptly against them. The necessity for their removal and for the removal of their contaminating influences would be greater than than now by all odds. I can readily guess what ticket they would vote if they were clothed with the ballot. [Laughter.] I should advocate with great earnestness their removal to prevent that political degradation and corruption which would jeopardize the security of our institutions. I am told by my honorable friend upon the right [Mr. TAYLOR] that these men in our midst grow fat. So does the parasitical mistletoe grow fat; but it saps and kills the source of its fatness.

I am told that these people are industrious. So are the locusts industrious. They leave your fields a waste; the others leave in their trail a moral desert which is more dangerous to the well-being of this people. I am told that we should be reconciled to the immigration of these people, because they contribute to our material prosperity, our material wealth. I doubt not they do. We are pointed to the fact that they build railroads and reclaim waste lands. Be it so. How long since our people were convinced that this Republic rests upon golden pillars and finds its security in the strength therein?

I oppose the immigration of these Chinese not more on account of the influence of their labor than for the moral degradation which does and the political degradation which may attend it. Why may we not feel concerned touching the social and moral influences exerted by contact with this servile, corrupt people? Let me ask, as pertinent to that question, another. What was the hope and expectation of our fathers in regard to the Republic and its free institutions? Did they cherish the hope and belief that we would find our security in our material prosperity, our wealth and power? Not at all. If they bore witness certainly to any cherished hope or conviction, it was that their sons would rightly apprehend the true sources of strength to maintain our free institutions.

#### CAN MATERIAL PROSPERITY TAKE THE PLACE OF INTELLIGENCE AND VIRTUE?

They assured us that our liberties would find their best defense and surest protection in the purity of the hearts of the people, in their virtue and intelligence. Sir, can it be doubted that this Republic will find greater security in a pure heart than a strong arm? Will gold and material prosperity take the place of virtue and intelligence among our citizens? Certainly not. I am opposed to the introduction in our midst of any influence which tends to debase man's moral nature, since in the purity and the ennobling of that nature my country finds its surest protection against the corruption which debases and the debasement which is the swift harbinger of ruin. Hence my protest through this bill against taking into our political and social organism incongruous elements, in the vain hope that we may Christianize and assimilate them. We are having trouble enough with the baleful influences with which we have to deal at this time; is it wise to complicate the problem by the introduction of a still more troublesome factor?

#### ERADICATE THE EVIL WHILE IT IS PRACTICABLE TO DO SO.

But some of my friends here assert that there are only 100,000 of these Chinese and we need not feel concerned; even if it be true that their influence is what we describe it to be, yet 100,000 is comparatively a few. Strange argument; that because the disease has not permeated our whole system with its withering and blighting effect we shall not attempt to cure it! In other words, because we can at this time successfully eradicate the evil we shall not do so! The converse of the proposition is, that when we cannot deal with it, when it is too mighty, when its corrupt and corrupting influences have permeated our whole system, then we may deal with it; deal with it when it is too late, instead of dealing with it while we can. [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] be extended.

Mr. PAGE. Until he finishes his speech.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I would have no objection to extending the time of the gentleman, but I understand that some gentlemen who registered their names early on the list at the Speaker's desk have been displaced in favor of members of the committee who at first had no intention to make speeches. As political discussion has been brought into this question by gentlemen on the other side, while it has been refrained from on the Democratic side, I must in justice to this side of the House (if a vote is to be taken to-morrow at three o'clock) object to any extension of time on the other side until we have had a fair opportunity to meet these insinuations and false imputations upon the Democratic side.

Mr. PAGE. Let me say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] that the previous question will not be called until both sides of the House are satisfied; until gentlemen on both sides have had a fair opportunity to speak in their own time.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. With that understanding I have no objection to extending the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWNE. I do not intend to object, but as discussion has been so far largely on the part of those who are in favor of the passage of this bill, it will be on condition that the same time shall be accorded to those who are opposed to the bill in the event they shall desire it.

Mr. PAGE. If any gentleman opposed to the passage of any bill wishes to have his time extended for the discussion of this question I hope the House will give him all the time he wants.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have only a word more to say beyond what I have already said.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has been extended by unanimous consent, and he will proceed.

#### BILL DEFENSIBLE AS A MEANS FOR PROTECTING OUR MORAL, SOCIAL, AND POLITICAL ORGANISMS FROM CORRUPTION AND DECAY.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Speaker, and I want but a few minutes and then I will yield the floor, and it is with a view to direct the attention of the House and the country to the special reason which prompts me to support this bill. It is that I desire to remove far from us all the influences that would tend to corrupt the source of political power in this Republic, which is the people; from the people it springs, and when that source of power is corrupted the Government itself becomes corrupt. I say here, sir, that every influence, from whatsoever quarter it may come, however it may assert itself, which tends to corrupt, to degrade, to demoralize the well-spring of governmental power in this country tends to the destruction of our free institutions, and he is no friend of freedom and its cause who hesitates in using every means which his conscience and intelligence approves to abate such influences. I cannot be wrong about this.

How constantly gentlemen recur to the matter of our material prosperity, which they say is universal, and to which these people have contributed. Grant it all, and are we therefore, in the midst of wealth and power, estopped to plead for purity and virtue and to urge that influences which corrupt the one and undermine the other shall be cast out? Do gentlemen forget that in the midst of material prosperity such as ours the greatest nations of the earth have fallen? It was not the want of material prosperity that led to the fall of the Roman Empire. It was the decay of civic virtue. It was not the want of material prosperity, it was not the want of intelligence, that led to the destruction of Athenian greatness. It was the decay of civic virtue.

I have to say to gentlemen of the House and to the country, let no one indulge the hope that our institutions are safe simply because of the devotion of our people to freedom and to country. These are in the main instincts, ennobling instincts I grant you, but instincts not common alone to men, and, unless they are supplemented and guided and controlled by virtue and intelligence they are quite as admirable in the brute as in man.

Why, Mr. Speaker, better the decay of our material prosperity than the blight of our civic virtue. We could endure the one; we could not survive the other and be free. My study of history and my observation of the signs of our own times induce me to be less afraid of the leprosy of the flesh which but destroys the body, than that which corrupts and degrades man's moral nature, and thus unfits him for the duties of citizenship in this country. Is it not manifest that we have enough to contend with now that tends to corrupt the social and political morals of our people? Shall our philanthropy so complicate the social and political problem that the knowledge and virtue of even such statesmen as oppose the pending bill cannot solve it? Not with my consent. To found our hopes of future security upon our wealth and power is indeed of the earth earthy, and not in harmony with the pure spirit which inspired the honorable gentlemen from Massachusetts and Ohio.

WEALTH AND POWER NOT THE BEST AND SAFEST GUARDIANS OF FREE INSTITUTIONS.

Our fathers never entertained the idea for one moment that the strength of the Republic they established was to be found in the richness of her mines, in the length and depth of her rivers, or the fertility of her soil; but, on the contrary, they have borne frequent testimony, as I have before remarked, that it rested upon man's moral nature, his religious nature, and upon his intellectual development. That security would be found in the purifying and ennobling of his nature, in the careful and devout study of his duty and accountability to God, in the cultivation of his intellectual faculties. This they commend to us as the surest and in fact only means of preserving the institutions and liberties which they secured and transmitted to us, and therefore churches and free schools abound in our land; free schools that all the children of the land may become wise in their day and generation to judge of men and measures, that they may not be misled by demagogues, that they may trace the history of other times and other nations and other republics, and thus become fitted to guide their own Republic far away from the rocks and shoals upon which the ancient republics were dashed and destroyed.

WEALTH AND EDUCATION TO BE CONTROLLED BY VIRTUE.

But education is not enough. The fathers entertained the belief that the well-being of the Republic required that among the people intelligence and education should be the handmaids of virtue and under its guidance and control. The influence resulting from wisdom, leavened by virtue, would prompt us not to oppress the Mongolian, but it would certainly not restrain us from protecting ourselves against the effects of his becoming a part of our social and political organism. What I urge is not prompted by a feeling of hate toward the Chinese. It occurs to me if we are at sea in a boat, and other voyagers on the same sea are pleased to seek comfort by climbing into ours, we are permitted to determine whether their coming in is consistent with our own safety, and we may and must act on our own judgment in the matter, and they must abide that judgment.

Mr. Speaker, the moral, religious, and philanthropic aspect of this question has been referred to here. Permit me for a single moment to call attention to a single utterance of my honorable colleague, [Mr. TAYLOR,] who so worthily fills the seat formerly occupied by the late distinguished statesman who was our President. He says that we seem to forget or neglect to observe that we are enjoined to go into all the earth and preach the gospel to every creature. I am perfectly willing that we shall go, but I am unwilling that the heathen shall come here if the harm to us is paramount to the good to them. I am unwilling, in order to give play to an impracticable philanthropy, to open wide the flood-gates through which will pour a constant stream of degraded and degrading humanity, at least until I find our own people so purified in their morality and elevated in their virtue, and so established and fixed in their Christianity that the influence of such a flood-tide of debasing leaven cannot affect perceptibly their condition.

GARFIELD, THE GREAT LABORER, TRUE TO THE CAUSE OF LABOR.

I wish here to refer for a moment to the sentiments of James A. Garfield, as expressed in his utterances upon this floor in 1878, touching the obligation of a nation to take care of those of its own household.

The sentiments then expressed are consonant with those contained in his letter of acceptance, and in the Republican platform. The question arose in a discussion on the tariff, between the honorable gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] and Mr. Garfield.

Mr. TUCKER had been, in the interest of free trade, indulging in a philanthropic view of the relations of men and of nations. Mr. Garfield said, (see thirty-first volume CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page 292:)

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] is too good a logician not to see that the theory he advocates can only be realized in a state of universal peace and brotherhood among the nations; for, in developing his plan, he says:

"Commerce, Mr. Chairman, links all mankind in one common brotherhood of mutual dependence and interests, and thus creates that unity of our race which makes the resources of all the property of each and every member. We cannot if we would, and should not if we could, remain isolated and alone. Men under the benign influence of Christianity yearn for intercourse, for the interchange of thought and the products of thought, as a means of a common progress toward a nobler civilization."

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe this.

He refers here to the tariff system.

Mr. Garfield continuing quotes Mr. TUCKER, as follows:

I cannot believe this is according to the divine plan. Christianity bids us seek in communion with our brethren of every race and clime the blessings they can afford us, and to bestow in return upon them those with which our new continent is destined to fill the world.

Mr. Garfield said in reply:

This I admit is a grand conception, a beautiful vision of the time when all the nations shall dwell in peace; when all will be, as it were, one nation, each furnishing to the others what they cannot profitably produce, and all working harmoniously together in the millennium of peace. If all the kingdoms of the world should become the kingdom of the Prince of Peace then I admit that universal free trade ought to prevail. But that blessed era is yet too remote to be made the basis of the practical legislation of to-day. We are not yet members of "the parliament of man, the federation of the world." For the present the world is divided into separate nationalities, and that other divine command still applies to our situation, "He that provideth not for his own household has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel," and until that better era arrives patriotism must supply the place of universal brotherhood. For the present, Gortschakoff can do more good to the world by taking care of Russia, the great Bismarck can accomplish more for his era by being, as he is, German to the core and promoting the welfare of the German Empire. Let Beaconsfield take care of England, and McMahon of France, and let Americans devote themselves to the welfare of America. When each does his best for his own nation to promote prosperity, justice, and peace all will have done more for the world than if all had attempted to be cosmopolitans rather than patriots. [Applause.]

"HE THAT PROVIDETH NOT FOR HIS OWN HOUSEHOLD HATH DENIED THE FAITH."

Thus, we observe that Garfield, while recognizing the precepts of divine inspiration, to which gentlemen have called our attention, yet insisted that that other divine command which condemns him that provideth not for his own household as worse than the infidel, is still operating and should influence our lives and conduct, and under its authority I still insist that our first duty is to those of our own national household. And in obedience to its authority I favor this bill; and I do it in the interest of religion, the purity of our national morality, the purity of our social system, the purity of our political system, the dignity and independence of labor and the laborer, the exaltation of the citizen by virtue of his citizenship.

OUR YOUNG REPUBLIC NOT A PEST HOUSE OR A PENAL COLONY.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only this to say touching our religious obligations to the nations of the earth. If the time shall ever come in the history of this country when our moral and intellectual growth shall keep pace, step by step, with our material prosperity; when we shall be freed from the vices and corruption that threaten the destruction of our political system—then, and not till then, will I consent to the experiment of civilizing, humanizing, Christianizing, and enlightening the heathen of the earth by taking them into our midst. But until then I say to them, "We ask not to abide in your tents, nor shall you in ours." Not with my consent shall the young Republic be made the pest-house for all the world, or a penal colony for all the nations of the earth.

I am aware that my friend here suggests that the Chinese are cleaner in person than our own laborers. I submit to him that he would scarcely be willing to stand up among the hardy laborers in his own district and say such a thing. His philanthropy has even washed and scrubbed those heathen and made them cleaner than the hardy toilers of his own neighborhood, our kinsmen.

OPPOSITIONS OF THIS BILL NOT LOGICAL

He intimates that they are an industrious, cleanly, moral people, and therefore ought to be desirable; and yet at the end of his argument he gave all the ripened fruits of his philanthropy away. For he says at once, turning to my honored friend from California, [Mr. PAGE,] "do not imagine that I desire to encourage the immigration of these people; I do not." Why not, if our purpose or mission upon earth is to humanize and Christianize them by bringing them into our midst; why not? What of your philanthropy that it is so accommodating? What becomes of your Christianity? He follows that by saying "I deplore their presence, and wish they were not among us." What an adjustable philanthropy! What a variable Christianity! What becomes of the charmed spirit of civilization which inspired my friend to appeal so pathetically to the better angel in our nature on behalf of these copper-colored brethren, when he can say "I deplore their presence among us?" Pregnant of the spirit of the civilization of the nineteenth century and the heaven of righteousness, he can yet exclaim, "I deplore the presence of these heathen." It

is an awkward position. If they are what he described them to be, they are a desirable people to be among us; if not, they are not. But he deprecates their presence, and that for a reason, and that reason is the degrading influence it exerts on our people, and further because he knows that presence tends to corrupt the fountain from whence flows all power and authority in this nation, the people; and anything which tends to that I am entirely and unalterably opposed to.

LET THE SOURCES OF OUR STRENGTH BE KEPT PURE.

I have detained the House longer than I intended. I have only further to say I am willing for one as an advocate of this bill to support such amendments as will keep it in perfect harmony with the letter and spirit of the treaty. I feel that a reduction of the term to fifteen years would do that. But I would not go beyond that. For, as I said, this young Republic is the last nation on earth that should appear before the world as having disregarded the slightest of her obligations. To this hour she has not blurred her escutcheon in the slightest by violating a single obligation she has taken upon her, nor would I have her do it now. But I would have her rid our people of a pest, that the sources of our strength, our happiness, our prosperity, may be kept unpolluted and secure. [Applause.]

I thank the House for its indulgence.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak in reference to this bill until I had examined the treaties we had formed with the Chinese, and the provisions of this bill. I feel greatly inclined to go with the gentlemen from the Pacific coast, representing the States lining the Pacific coast, on this question, because it is a question, Mr. Speaker, in which they and their interests are peculiarly involved. And it is with great reluctance, and indeed with diffidence in regard to my own judgment, that I oppose what they seem to regard as essential to the welfare of the States on our Pacific coast.

Some years ago I voted for a bill which proposed to regulate and restrict Chinese immigration, while a member of this House, and I am willing now to vote for a bill which shall clothe our Government by the power of its legislation with a right to limit and to regulate Chinese immigration if we shall think it necessary. But I am opposed, Mr. Speaker, upon principle, to violating any treaty obligation into which we enter with any people. I have stood, sir, upon this floor since it has been my fortune to be a member of Congress, and have persistently insisted that the treaty obligations of the Government of the United States with the aboriginal tribes that inhabited this territory before our ancestors came here should be fulfilled in good faith according to the terms of the treaty. And I am unwilling to see any measure of legislation adopted in this country which shall be adopted in violation of the spirit and the letter of a solemn treaty obligation you have made with these people. I shall therefore, when the proper time comes, move to limit this suspension of Chinese immigration to ten years instead of the twenty years proposed in this bill. And I shall propose that because I believe that in the next decade we will be able to learn how far it is the interest of this country and the duty of this country to prevent this immigration.

I do not belong to the class of gentlemen represented by my friend from Ohio, [Mr. BUTTERWORTH,] who have lost faith in the power of our country to extend its civilization, its laws, its morals, its high sense of duty everywhere. We have had, Mr. Speaker, a very solemn test of the power of American civilization. You tell me that the Chinamen who come here are ignorant and steeped in vice, incurable, not to be reached even by the great Gospel dispensation of the common Master of the whole human race. I do not believe it. I am not prepared, and I hope this House is not prepared, to say that that Mongolian nationality which embraces in China four hundred and thirty-four millions of the human race, and in Japan thirty-nine millions of the human race, I am not prepared to say, as an American citizen and as a Congressman in the United States Congress, that the power of civilization and religion cannot reach these people.

Why, sir, what have you been doing? In the century of your national existence which you have just passed, from the primary treaty which you made with these people down to the very last treaty which they made with you, witnessing on their part the most singular moderation ever shown by any nation in treating with another; in the whole history of your national existence for a century, you have been trying to break down what you call the Chinese walls, within which they have excluded themselves from the rest of mankind. And just, Mr. Speaker, as you have accomplished this, just as you have opened the ports of China to your trade, just as you have opened the ports of Japan to your trade, just as you have sent your missionaries bearing the olive-branch of peace and good will to all mankind, you propose now to adopt the very policy which for a century you have attempted by your diplomacy to break down in China and Japan. Wonderful history of a wonderful people!

I say, sir, I do not believe in restricting the power of American civilization to plant its standard like the cross of Christ wherever the human race exists, of whatever color and of whatever language. [Applause.] I have said that we have had a severe test of this; and we have had it, sir, with reference to these people whom we have with us here. More than a century ago they came speaking in the unmeaning gibberish of the Guinea negro. They were brought here by the agency of northern people. They were taken from the wild jungles of Africa, where the camelopard and the tiger bounded in

the vast amphitheater of his native land. They were brought here and settled in the inhospitable region of New England. They were found unsuited to that cold and intemperate climate, and that same philanthropy, guided by that overruling Providence "which shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will," transplanted them to the slumbering savannahs of the flower-scented South. There they took root and grew and flourished and waxed strong under that patriarchal institution which I am now about to hear for the first time recognized in its large and intelligent beneficence and philanthropy. In contact with the Caucasian race, those slaves, at the expiration of a century from the time they were first brought here, all at once, as Minerva sprung from the thigh of Jove, armed *cap-a-pie* to contend with the animals of the forest and to proclaim her triumph—so this people, ignorant, uneducated, uneducable as it was thought, unreligious as it was thought, far more pagan than the Chinese, at the expiration of one century, when the manacles were stricken from their limbs by the proclamation of Mr. Lincoln and the results of the war, they sprung at once into the arena flaming with the intelligence of the nineteenth century. They have occupied your pulpits and your school-houses and your halls of legislation, and have even been represented by a distinguished Senator in the other end of the Capitol, while a full-fledged African spoke in the very citadel of liberty at Boston to the descendants of the men who fought at Bunker Hill.

I am not afraid, therefore, when I see the results upon the colored people, when I see the intelligence they have attained, when I see their religious feelings, (for they are an eminently religious people,) when I see the wisdom and prudence which they manifested during the war of the rebellion, as you term it, and which they have manifested since—I am not afraid, are you, gentlemen, that your civilization and your power to plant the cross of Christ and the principles of liberty shall find in the oldest nation of the world a people incapable of appreciating them?

I have said that I want to observe the treaties with these people. I have said that they have exhibited most wonderful patience. It is within the memory, no doubt, of my distinguished friend from California, [Mr. PAGE,] to whom I give all credit for the earnestness and zeal and the patriotism by which I have no doubt he is influenced—but it is within his memory, no doubt, that when this Chinese wall had been broken down in China and Japan, when the ports of that country had been opened to our commerce and ours had been opened to theirs—it is no doubt within his memory that when Mr. Burlingame, who with Mr. Seward negotiated the treaty of 1868, returned to the shores of the Pacific coast and landed in the great city of San Francisco, upon that beautiful bay where the evening sun throws its light in magnificent splendor upon the Golden Gate of California, no ovation was ever paid to any man in American history greater than that which California paid to Mr. Burlingame. You had by that treaty opened up relations, commercial relations, with the oldest nation on the globe. You had secured to your ministers of the Gospel, bearing the banner of Christ in their hands, the right to plant it everywhere in China, and you had given to the Chinaman the same rights here. The nation looked upon it as a consummation of diplomatic skill and power which had never before been manifested by any people.

Shall we turn around now when we have thus opened to the commerce of America, the civilization of America, and the religion of our people, this great empire of the East; shall we now turn around and build up a high Chinese wall on the California coast, and say to these people, as did the inhabitants of Kansas and Topeka when the negroes went in there from the South too numerous for their peace—are we to say as they did: "We want no more paupers here?" Is that what you are going to say to China? Is that your idea on the subject? Is that your notion about it? Discussing this bill as we are, almost within hearing of the great minister from that empire, the oldest in the world, shall we turn these people back? Shall we in the emphatic language of Mr. Morton, that leader of the Republican party, that man of wonderful power and might, who ruled the party in the Senate and controlled and mastered it in the country; when he went to California to investigate this great question, and returned and made his report to the Senate, he said, "Are you going to take a step a century backward? Are you going to adopt in America the very principles which in all the light of your civilization you have labored to break down in China?" That was the argument that he addressed to the Senate in the memorable report which he made. I say it would be going back upon the history of this country to undertake now to declare that we will exclude these people. Exclude them if you will, but do not do it upon a false ground.

What is the evidence as to what these people are? Sir, their civilization, their magnificent position in arts, in science, in politics, in everything that makes a nation great, had been attained by them hundreds of years before your nationality ever had an existence.

Now, should we turn our backs against the oldest people in the world because they are yellow-skinned and almond-eyed? I thought we had a civilization like our religion, that found no limit save that which the grand charity and noble dispensation of the Master of the Universe gave it; that, like the sunshine and the air, it went wherever the human race went and planted the cross by the side of the human footstep, whether in a savage or a civilized land. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, we must respect our treaty obligations with this people. Here are treaties which they never asked us to make, but which we asked them to make—begged and implored them to make. They

never wanted Chinamen to come to this country. They never desired that the Chinese should emigrate. They never sought treaty relations with us, but we sought treaty relations with them. We sought them against a prejudice which at one time we thought we should never be able to overcome, because it had existed among that people for centuries, extending back across the ages to the time of Confucius; and far beyond the time of Confucius the august empire extends until its origin is lost in the twilight of fable. This people never asked you to make treaties with them. You sought them; you sent your plenipotentiaries; you asked that their ports should be opened. England, aiding you, waged a war. It is a very memorable fact that almost all Chinamen come to this country from the port of Hong-Kong, an English port; and you propose to establish restrictions in violation not only of the treaties you have made with the Chinese, but those you have made with England.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, for my time is brief, to call attention to the language of the treaty. The first section of this treaty provides:

Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country, or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it.

I say that no people ever treated you with such liberality as the Chinese Government. When you made your first treaty with the Chinese in 1858, the Chinese Government assented not only to your carrying your citizens there, but also your religion. In article 5 of the Burlingame treaty it is declared—

The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other for the purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as a permanent residence. The high contracting parties therefore join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary emigration for these purposes. They consequently agree to pass laws making it a penal offense for a citizen of the United States or Chinese subjects to take Chinese subjects either to the United States or to any other foreign country, or for a Chinese subject or citizen of the United States to take citizens of the United States to China or to any other foreign country without their free and voluntary consent respectively.

That was the stipulation of the Burlingame treaty. Again it is declared, in article 4:

The twenty-ninth article of the treaty of the 18th of June, 1858, having stipulated for the exemption of Christian citizens of the United States and Chinese converts from persecutions in China on account of their faith, it is further agreed that citizens of the United States in China of every religious persuasion, and Chinese subjects in the United States shall enjoy entire liberty of conscience, and shall be exempt from all disability or persecution on account of their religious faith or worship in either country.

Is there any enlightened American representative here who will say that that was not a treaty of amity and concord which should be kept in good faith? The Chinese Government assented to every proposition that you made in the Burlingame treaty. Your minister came back after its ratification, receiving the honors of the country. And now, after the passage of your bill of 1880, the Chinese Government again treated with you giving you the right to interdict the immigration into this country of Chinese who were diseased, who were lepers, who were criminals. In this way, the Burlingame treaty was amended in 1880. In 1881 China agreed to still further amend the first article of which I have read.

Gentlemen talk about this people not being civilized, not being Christianized, about their not keeping good faith. But when under the very terms of the treaty which you had demanded they should make with you there had been imported into this country from seventy-five thousand to one hundred thousand of their people, who were on the Pacific coast, you approached that government as late as 1881 and said, "We want you to agree to a treaty by which the United States shall have power by legislation to regulate and even to suspend this immigration." What did the Chinese Government do? It met your proposition broadly; it conceded the right to regulate and even to suspend but not absolutely to prohibit Chinese immigration. Did ever a people act more liberally toward another than China has acted toward the Government of the United States? Did ever a people assent to your representations more cordially and more kindly? But now you propose to requite this treatment by saying that you will not give protection even to the Chinese who are here—that you want them to be returned.

Mr. PAGE. I never said anything about sending them back. Mr. HOOKER. Well, your laws have said something about it. Let me read from them. It was said by the gentleman from California in the course of his speech that these Chinese congregated about the cities and towns in districts exclusively confined to themselves. Why, sir, this only affords another evidence of the docility and teachability of this people. Why did they do that? I read from the laws of California in reference to this people.

Mr. PAGE. What year? Mr. HOOKER. I think the law was enacted in 1857; at any rate you will find it on page 1545 of the third volume of the Code and Statutes of California. It reads in this way:

The board of trustees or other legislative authority of any incorporated city or town, and the board of supervisors of any incorporated city or county, are hereby granted the power, and it is hereby made their duty, to pass and enforce any and all acts or ordinances or resolutions necessary to cause the removal without the limits of such cities and towns, or city and county, of any Chinese now within or hereafter to come within such limits: *Provided*, That they may set apart certain prescribed portions of the limits of such cities, or towns, or city and county, for the location therein of such Chinese.

Mr. PAGE. That law was passed recently. That always has been the custom in the city of San Francisco.

Mr. HOOKER. It is not confined to the city of San Francisco. Now, these Chinese have proved most obedient residents in our midst. You exclude them by your legislation.

Mr. CASSIDY. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi that law was enacted as a protection against the spread of fire from these Chinese huts which were huddled together. A fire breaking out in their midst has often been the cause of the destruction of many of our towns. That was done as a protection against fire.

Mr. HOOKER. It was a new sort of fire insurance company, and that is all I have to say about it. [Laughter.]

What became of your own law which was passed in California, which now stands on your statute books, and which I have here before me? It is as follows:

Any officer, director, manager, member, stockholder, clerk, agent, servant, attorney, employee, assignee, or contractor of any corporation now existing or hereafter formed under the laws of this State who shall employ in any manner or capacity upon any work or business of such corporation any Chinese or Mongolian is guilty of a misdemeanor, and is punishable by a fine of not less than one hundred nor more than one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail of not less than fifty nor more than five hundred days, or by both such fine and imprisonment: *Provided*, That no director of a corporation shall be deemed guilty under this section who refuses to assent to such employment, and has such dissent recorded in the minutes of the board of directors.

Mr. PAGE. Will the gentleman allow me for one moment?

Mr. HOOKER. Certainly, to ask me a question.

Mr. PAGE. That is all I desire.

Mr. HOOKER. I do not wish to have a speech injected into mine.

Mr. PAGE. I do not wish to inject a speech into the gentleman's.

Mr. HOOKER. Well, go on.

Mr. PAGE. The other day the gentleman from Ohio made an attack on the people of California because they did not employ these Chinese, and now, when the Legislature of California has passed a law which since then has been declared unconstitutional, that the people should not employ them; that is, those incorporated under the incorporation laws of the State, the gentleman from Mississippi makes an attack upon the people of California that they are against employing them.

Mr. HOOKER. Has the supreme court of your State decided that law to be unconstitutional?

Mr. PAGE. It has.

Mr. HOOKER. Then I am glad to see your judges are more liberal than your legislators, and that they are governed by principles of justice in this matter.

Mr. PAGE. I would not like to say what Legislature passed that.

Mr. HOOKER. I have only to say that no more patient people live anywhere than these Chinese under the circumstances. They have assented to everything you proposed. You asked them to open China to your own merchants, and you proposed to open the United States to the Chinese merchants. They assented to it. You found, after some experience, that it is not profitable. You do not think it is to the interest of our people to continue that policy. You wish to exclude the Chinese. You want to narrow the treaties instead of broadening them. You want, in this enlightened nineteenth century, to establish the same policy for the United States which China had established for so many centuries. They have opened ports of China to our commerce, and the intelligent head of the Bureau of Statistics, in reply to a dispatch I sent him yesterday, has furnished me a *seriatim* account annually of the condition of the trade with China from 1848 down to the present time. It is too long and too tedious to read in the House, but I will embody it in my remarks and have it printed in the RECORD. It is as follows:

*Value of merchandise imported into and exported from the United States.*  
[China, including Hong-Kong.]

Yearended June 30—	Exports.		Total ex- ports.	Imports.	Total im- ports and exports.
	Domestic.	Foreign.			
1858.....	\$2,783,754	\$127,399	\$2,911,153	\$10,570,442	\$13,481,595
1859.....	3,707,084	172,885	3,879,969	10,788,767	14,668,736
1860.....	5,624,870	159,877	5,784,747	13,566,087	19,350,834
1861.....	4,186,259	197,690	4,383,949	11,351,281	15,735,230
1862.....	2,205,163	167,147	2,372,310	7,540,048	9,912,358
1863.....	2,897,005	222,556	3,119,561	11,030,149	14,149,710
1864.....	3,249,448	84,566	3,334,014	10,435,027	13,769,041
1865.....	2,631,825	37,624	2,669,449	5,129,917	7,799,366
1866.....	3,045,610	99,621	3,145,231	10,131,142	13,276,373
1867.....	3,550,815	27,993	3,578,808	12,112,440	15,691,248
1868.....	3,942,332	37,682	3,980,014	11,364,999	15,365,013
1869.....	5,170,884	32,354	5,203,238	*13,207,361	18,410,599
1870.....	3,051,616	64,765	3,116,381	14,565,527	17,681,908
1871.....	2,041,836	28,996	2,070,832	20,064,365	22,135,197
1872.....	2,915,465	21,370	2,936,835	26,752,835	29,689,670
1873.....	2,547,085	8,885	2,555,970	27,191,759	29,747,729
1874.....	2,078,565	55,096	2,133,661	18,568,940	20,702,601
1875.....	3,551,038	15,710	3,566,748	14,676,416	18,243,164
1876.....	4,715,115	14,777	4,729,892	12,847,633	17,577,525
1877.....	4,903,075	34,631	4,937,706	12,301,684	17,239,390
1878.....	6,850,931	16,324	6,867,255	18,120,483	24,987,738
1879.....	5,930,954	11,245	5,942,199	18,084,694	24,026,893
1880.....	3,974,447	4,328	3,978,775	24,020,707	27,999,482
1881.....	8,361,949	2,585	8,364,534	24,717,557	33,082,091

\*Also including Singapore for 1869.

*Value of gold and silver coin and bullion imported into and exported from the United States.*

[China, including Hong-Kong.]

Year ended June 30—	Exports.		Total ex- ports.	Imports.	Total im- ports and exports.
	Domestic.	Foreign.			
1858 .....	\$223,994	\$2,562,204	\$2,786,198	\$94	\$2,786,292
1859 .....	525,932	2,721,298	3,247,230	2,614	3,249,844
1860 .....	1,545,914	1,575,457	3,121,371	500	3,121,871
1861 .....	1,623,465	910,013	2,533,478	438	2,533,916
1862* .....	2,123,343	1,126,585	3,249,928	6,783	3,256,711
1863* .....	2,295,079	941,095	3,236,174	4,766	3,240,940
1864* .....	4,492,550	956,502	5,449,052	974	5,450,026
1865 .....	3,871,073	564,913	4,435,986	726	4,436,712
1866 .....	5,586,478	1,418,115	7,004,593	1,541	7,006,134
1867 .....	5,237,330	951,478	6,188,808	.....	6,188,808
1868 .....	5,579,454	2,132,022	7,711,476	25	7,711,501
1869 .....	5,087,294	2,085,200	7,172,494	1,760	7,174,254
1870 .....	3,369,547	2,554,138	5,923,685	62,960	5,986,645
1871 .....	1,878,380	1,693,267	3,571,647	1,950	3,573,597
1872 .....	4,799,470	1,199,865	5,999,335	700	6,000,035
1873 .....	4,789,608	2,364,941	7,154,549	181	7,154,730
1874 .....	6,621,400	2,759,641	9,381,041	39,772	9,420,813
1875 .....	5,210,966	1,392,403	6,603,369	6,840	6,610,209
1876 .....	5,842,947	2,086,642	7,929,589	6,908	7,936,497
1877 .....	12,255,259	3,175,606	15,430,865	10,952	15,441,817
1878 .....	13,200,925	3,011,650	16,212,575	7,559	16,220,134
1879 .....	4,413,618	3,017,744	7,431,362	134,635	7,565,997
1880 .....	4,282,381	2,230,442	6,512,823	90,991	6,603,814
1881 .....	1,367,034	2,111,568	3,478,602	41,179	3,519,781

\*Includes Japan.

That table, Mr. Speaker, shows a most wonderful increase in the trade and commerce of this country with China. So great indeed had it become that we absolutely coined a trade-dollar intended to be the means of keeping up our trade with China, and to-day there exists nearly \$30,000,000 of that coin in the Empire of China. More than that, Mr. Speaker, China and Japan are the great silver consuming countries of the world. They are the great silver using countries of the world. What is to become of the vast product which is taken from the mines of California, Nevada, and Oregon if we are to cut off this enormous trade with the Empires of China and Japan? The silver produced in this country now finds its just investment there.

Not only that, sir, but if you adopt in this enlightened nineteenth century a policy of legislation toward the Chinese like that which is pending in this House to-day, then you may look for a large decrease instead of any increase in our commerce. Instead of increasing by millions, as it has since our first treaty with China, it will rapidly decrease until it will entirely vanish. That vast trade absorbed by England will desert your northern ports and your Pacific coast and will seek its exit to the markets of the world through the Isthmus of Suez. You will be left, when you have expelled these people and destroyed this commercial intercourse, very much as the Spaniards were left when they drove the Moors from Spain and were left with their country a desert; or as France was left when it expelled those magnificent Huguenots, who settled the State of South Carolina, and, mingling with an immigration from other European countries, gave us a people which has aided in a wonderful degree in building us up to that great height of nationality and civilization we now occupy.

No, sir, it will not do for us to violate our treaty stipulations. I would say to the conscience and fairmindedness of every member of this House who has a vote upon this question, let us so act in this matter that we shall not be held up before the world as violating the treaty stipulations we have ourselves sought and begged these people to make with us. Why, sir, there can be no time and no occasion when it would be more inconvenient for us to adopt such a policy than this. We must look to the facts of this case, not to theories. Now, is it the fact that the Chinese have degraded our labor?

It is in your memory and in that of many members of this House, that so anxious were the people of this country to understand the condition of Chinese labor in California that they established a committee to go there and examine the condition of these people. And I may be pardoned if I ask the attention of the House for some moments to some points in the report made by the late Senator Morton, of Indiana, the chairman of that committee. That committee went there to investigate this very question of Chinese labor and its influence on other labor in California. It was composed of gentlemen from the Eastern and the Western States, and they investigated this whole question. When Mr. Morton came back to the Senate of the United States he made a report, from which I beg leave to read, with brevity, a few passages. He says on page 2 of this report:

At a time when those countries have adopted a liberal policy, and in that respect have yielded to western civilization, and have especially recognized the force of the example and policy of the United States, it is proposed that we shall take a step backward by the adoption of their cast-off policy of exclusion. The argument set up here in favor of this is precisely that which was so long used to excuse or justify the same policy in China and Japan, namely, that the admission of foreigners tended to interfere with their trade and the labor of their people and to corrupt their morals and degrade their religion.

That was the argument of China, made against your earnest protest, when you desired to open her ports and commerce and schools to your missionaries and your trade. Further he says:

The limitation of the right to become naturalized to white persons was placed in the law when slavery was a controlling influence in our Government; was maintained by the power of that institution, and is now retained by the lingering prejudices growing out of it. After having abolished slavery, and by amendments to our Constitution, and the enactment of various statutes establishing the equal, civil, and political rights of all men, without regard to race or color, and at a time when we are endeavoring to overcome the prejudices of education and of race, and to secure to colored men the equal enjoyment of their rights, it would be inconsistent and unsound policy to renew and reassert the prejudices against race and another form of civilization by excluding the copper-colored people of Asia from our shores. It would be again to recognize the distinctions of race and to establish a new governmental policy upon the basis of color and a different form of civilization and religion.

Further on he says, and, mark you, this was the report of your own committee sent to California to ascertain facts, and to proclaim them to the people of the United States:

As a rule, they are industrious, temperate, and honest in their dealings. Some thousands of them are employed as household servants in the cities and in the country. In this capacity the testimony generally concurs in giving them a high character.

I have a table which shows that of the Chinamen in San Francisco there are 6,000 employed as domestic servants.

They very readily learn to perform all kinds of household duty, are devoted to their employment, and soon become exceedingly skillful. The testimony proved that they went to all parts of the State to serve in that capacity, when other servants or help of that kind could not be obtained from the cities, and that if they were banished it would be very hard, in fact, as many of the witnesses said, impossible to supply their places. As laborers upon the farms and in the gardens and vineyards, nearly all of the witnesses speak of them in the highest terms. Colonel Hollister, one of the largest farmers in California, and a man of great intelligence, testified that without the Chinese the wheat and other crops in California could not be harvested and taken to market; that white labor could not be obtained for prices that would enable the farmer to carry on his business; that any considerable increase in the price of labor would render the production of wheat and almost every other agricultural product unprofitable, and they would have to be abandoned.

Mr. PAGE. Whose testimony is that?

Mr. HOOKER. It is the testimony of Colonel Hollister, one of the largest farmers in California.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; he owns twenty-five or thirty thousand acres; and he employs that kind of labor, and is about the only farmer in California who does.

Mr. HOOKER. The report continues:

As laborers upon the public works they were entirely reliable, worked more hours than white men, were not given to strikes, and never undertook by combinations to control the price of labor.

That is the testimony of the Morton committee.

Mr. BERRY. The reason why is because they are slaves.

Mr. HOOKER. What makes them slaves?

Mr. BERRY. They are brought there by the Six Companies. Their labor is servile.

Mr. HOOKER. My friend is mistaken. I want to read now what the Six Companies say. We want the facts, and here is what the Six Companies say:

We solemnly declare that we, the Six Chinese Companies, are purely benevolent societies.

Mr. PAGE. That is what the Chinese themselves say.

Mr. HOOKER. Let me read what they say:

We solemnly declare that we, the Six Chinese Companies, are purely benevolent societies. We never, singly or collectively, as individuals or companies, brought one of our countrymen to this free country, under or by any contract or agreement made anywhere, as a servant or laborer. We never have before heard that our people desiring to come here sold their relatives to obtain the means to come. We have never yet let, hired, or contracted one of our people out to labor; neither have we ever exercised the slightest control or restraint over our people after they came here, nor claimed, or demanded, or received one dollar of their earnings. We have never acted, directly or indirectly, as the agent or agents of any one of our people who advanced the means for one of our people to come here.

That is signed by the presidents of the Six Companies.

Mr. PAGE. Will not the gentleman now turn to some of the other testimony and read it?

Mr. HOOKER. You can read it yourself when you have the floor.

Mr. PAGE. Of course. You have read the testimony of the Chinese companies, and I ask you to read the testimony of hundreds of others which is directly the reverse.

Mr. HOOKER. Let the gentleman produce that testimony in his own speech.

Mr. PAGE. It is in that very book from which the gentleman has read.

Mr. HOOKER. Then produce it. I have read what these people say. They are Chinese, you say; they cannot utter the truth; they cannot be relied upon. If not, then in God's name they need something of the spirit of liberty-loving American people infused into them, and to have the Gospel preached to them.

I have heard of some people who were too good to be embraced in the Christian plan of civilization, but I have never heard of any so low, so ignorant, and so vile as to be beyond the influence of that civilization. Our great Master, when he hung upon the cross, turned to the two thieves by his side, pardoned their sins, washed them white as wool in his blood, and translated them to heaven with himself.

A MEMBER. Only one of the thieves went there. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOOKER. I regret that I have not the time to read still more of the testimony which Mr. Morton gives here, but I will refer to one other passage. He says further that while there were complaints

that the Chinese by their cheap labor—and this is the argument of my friends from California—took the means of obtaining a support from the white people, inquiry failed to show that there were any considerable number of white people in California out of employment, except those who were willfully idle; that there was work and remunerative work for all who chose to perform it.

That is the testimony given by these enlightened American statesmen, without any personal interest in the question, who went there and took the testimony of all of every grade and class in California. In this report is quoted the testimony of others, Army officers and residents there, and they all concur in testifying that the Chinese are sober, temperate, and exemplary laborers. It is true that the Chinaman has the misfortune to have a yellow skin and almond-shaped eyes. It was the misfortune of the colored man that he had a black skin. But even with that misfortune our civilization reached him, and he is now a full-fledged American citizen, with the ballot in his hand, and with all the powers, duties, and responsibilities of an intelligent American freeman. Now do you not think that if we could produce these results on the African we might try our influence on the Chinaman, particularly as they are a people always distinguished for their intelligence? This report is full of testimony to that effect.

Yet, just at this time when all civilized nations are raising their hands in horror at the atrocities inflicted upon an ancient race, when the news is flashed across the cable of the ocean and intelligence is brought us that the oldest people we know of, the Jews, are being scourged and abused, villified and maltreated by the power of Russia; and every city in your country has opened its doors, every hamlet and hovel even has welcomed these descendants of ancient Israel to American freedom and American liberty—do you not think it is a bad time to turn against one-third of the human race, and say that they cannot be embraced either in the plan of salvation or within the civilization, refinement, and religious culture that belongs to the Caucasian race?

The evidence with regard to these people is that there are now but 105,000 of them in this country, according to the last census. And according to the same census there are from 50,000,000 to 55,000,000 of the Caucasian race in this country.

Is there any fear that your civilization will be endangered, that your religion will be overturned, that your government will be disturbed by this people? I believe not, sir. It may be said that the bringing of the Africans to this country caused a great and bloody war eventually. True, it did; but they came out of it freemen. It is not the first time in the history of the English-speaking people that we have gone from words to blows. We are a liberty-loving people, an aggressive people. We have shown this by the treaties we have compelled China to make, by the earnestness with which we sought them. We may be prepared probably for other scenes in which Anglo-Saxon shall meet Anglo-Saxon, but out of all this terrible conflict there comes still the recognition of the fact that we are one people, ruled over by a common God, dominated by a common American and Caucasian civilization.

From the earliest periods of English history the English-speaking people have asserted their right to freedom of conscience and freedom of person. Should we pause now and say that we will not extend this principle to one-third of the human race? We have asserted this principle from the time when our ancestors were conquered at the battle of Hastings, in 1066. Many an American who differed with an American, many an Englishman who differed with an Englishman, can say now what the beautiful blue-eyed Saxon boy said to the Saxon king who was about to deliver him to William of Normandy as a hostage for the plighted faith of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors. At that time the court of William of Normandy was the gayest in Europe; and the king rather reproached himself for trusting the youth as a hostage in that gay court. But the boy fixed his clear eye on his uncle and said to him: "If, my uncle, when I return from the court of William of Normandy you shall judge by the cut of my hair or the fashion of my garb that I am Norman, you shall lay your hand upon my heart and feel England beat in every pulse."

The English-speaking people love liberty—liberty of person and liberty of conscience. It was this which animated our ancestors when they made their Declaration of Rights; which animated the English Parliament when it passed the bill of rights; which animated our own more immediate English-speaking ancestors when in the City of Brotherly Love, in the great Hall of Independence, they made that solemn declaration which thundered over the continent, which was caught up by the long-swell of the Atlantic and wafted to the ears of the crowned monarchs of the Old World—the memorable and solemn declaration that "these colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States."

Shall we go back upon this history thus canonized in blood? Shall we say that we now hesitate to plant the standard of civilization which we have erected in this country in any country or any land? Shall it not be rather said to be like the cross of the Redeemer that shall go along with the human race, impoverished or even criminal as it may be, and shall be planted wherever that race exists? I know of no power to limit it. While I am unwilling to encumber the Pacific coast with a population which our friends from that section do not desire; while they seem to have set themselves against its existence there in any form in which it can be commingled with

that community, I say we cannot go back upon our own history, we cannot violate the treaties we have made with that power which has to-day its minister in Washington representing 430,000,000 of the human race.

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman knows anything of the state of affairs now existing on the Pacific coast, does he believe there is any necessity of restricting this immigration at all? Does he intend to vote for any bill at all restricting this immigration?

Mr. HOOKER. I am going to amend your bill to make it practicable, to prevent it from being vetoed, as it must be if passed in its present shape.

Mr. PAGE. Does the gentleman speak by authority on that point?

Mr. HOOKER. No, sir; only from my knowledge that the Executive will feel bound to carry out our treaties after we have made them. I have no personal information on the subject at all.

Mr. PAGE. Does the gentleman believe that there is any necessity for restricting at all Chinese immigration of the class referred to?

Mr. HOOKER. I will answer the gentleman. I listen with great respect to the representations of the gentleman and his colleagues from the Pacific coast in reference to this subject. They tell me that there is such necessity, and I am inclined to believe they are better informed than I am. I am disposed to yield to their views upon this question so far as possible. But if the gentleman wants my opinion as to whether California has been injured by the incoming of the Chinese, I refer him to the report of the late Senator Morton, in which reference is made to the great public works that have been carried on by Chinese labor—the Tulare lands, which have been thus reclaimed and fitted for the occupation and labor of the white people, as they never would have been if the Chinese had not come to this country. That is the testimony of Mr. Morton, the chairman of the committee who went to California to examine this question. I take it for granted that he did examine it thoroughly; I take it for granted that he reported truthfully the condition of affairs.

Mr. PAGE. Does not the gentleman know that the Morton report was a minority report, claiming to give only the views of Mr. Morton, as against six of his colleagues on the committee?

Mr. HOOKER. Very well. Mr. Morton makes this report; he gives quotations from the evidence of witnesses sustaining what he says, and unless he has misrepresented the testimony taken before the committee, then his report is worthy of belief.

Mr. PAGE. Does not the gentleman know that what is termed the Morton report was never signed by Mr. Morton; that it is made up of papers claimed to have been left by him at the time of his death, but that the report was never signed by him?

Mr. HOOKER. I do not think any one has ever doubted that Mr. Morton wrote this report, whether he signed it or not.

Mr. ORTH. Mr. Morton's authorship of that report is as well established as the fact that he lived and died.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman from California is disposed to discuss this question dispassionately. I have not the slightest feeling on the subject. If it were possible consistently with our treaties with China, I should be glad to allow the gentlemen from California and Nevada and Oregon (much as I think they mistake their interests) to regulate this question to suit their own people. But as that is not possible without a violation of our treaty stipulations with the Chinese Government, I stand here to endeavor to perfect this bill and put it in such a shape as shall keep it within the purview of our treaty obligations, so that it shall not turn away from our shores the tide of commerce which is setting toward us from the Asiatic countries, but shall give us all the advantages which the Burlingame treaty was designed to secure for us. That treaty is very remarkable. You talk about their being pagans and unchristian. Let me read one single clause of their treaty and what they say about the admission of your people. It is article 29, and is as follows:

The principles of the Christian religion, as professed by the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches, are recognized as teaching men to do good, and to do to others as they would have others do to them. Hereafter those who quietly profess and teach these doctrines shall not be harassed or persecuted on account of their faith. Any person, whether citizen of the United States or Chinese convert, who, according to these tenets, peaceably teach and practice the principles of Christianity, shall in no case be interfered with or molested.

Is that unchristian? And yet you say in a spirit of contempt they are pagans. Can you doubt of the power of the Word of God being manifested there so as to penetrate the hearts and minds of these Chinese people? Do you limit the power of the Christian religion? Do you say it can go to the African, it can go to the Caucasian, but to the Mongolian it cannot go and does not belong? Is that what you say, and are you prepared to shut out these people? If so, are you not setting a dangerous precedent?

Many gentlemen about me have lived with me in this country at a time when an effort was made to exclude from our midst the people of another race. It was about the year 1855. It was then said the Irish Catholic was a dangerous element, he who since then has been so much lauded as possessing such marvelous assimilating qualities in favor of our republican institutions. [Laughter.] The crusade then begun against the Irish Catholic, though successful at first in misleading the people, went down at last in ruin and disgrace. It is now no more than a word of reproach. "Know-nothing" now is a byword of scorn and contempt.

Mr. Speaker, it was left for that broad-minded Englishman who wrote so splendidly the Protestant history of England to say, when the Jewish disability act was under discussion in the English Parliament, that for ages it had been the custom to call these men cursed Jews, dogs of Jews, but that the nation which could boast of Isaiah among its poets and the Maccabees among its generals could not be derided by any English-speaking people. And when this Know-nothing party was raised to limit immigration of Irish Catholics, which wanted to shut out immigrants because of their race and religion, this same broad-minded Englishman, in his famous criticism upon Ranke's History of the Popes, used this language, which, for cogent force and the swelling grandeur of its sentences, cannot be surpassed:

There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers abounded in the Flavian amphitheater. The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiff. That line we trace back in an unbroken series from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth, and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable. The Republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the Republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the Republic of Venice is gone and the Papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigor.

The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the farthest ends of the world missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustin, and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. Her acquisitions in the New World have more than compensated for what she has lost in the Old. Her spiritual ascendancy extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn, countries which a century hence may not improbably contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe. The members of her communion are certainly not fewer than a hundred and fifty millions, and it will be difficult to show that all other Christian sects united amount to a hundred and twenty millions. Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world, and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the Temple of Mecca.

Mr. Speaker, we have led the world in recent years in friendly intercourse among the nations of the earth, and we cannot now afford to take any step backward in our relations with the great Chinese Empire. One hundred thousand of her people, under the provisions of our treaty, have come to our shores and settled in our midst. Do you believe, if the conditions were reversed and our citizens were in China instead of Chinese in the United States, we could be successfully appealed to to inhibit further emigration and consent to the passage of passport laws by which even those who were permitted to remain should be hampered in their every movement from one place to another? Yet this China has done. With 100,000 of her people here, brought here by your own act, solicited to come in all your treaties, urged to emigrate, and yet been subjected to all these annoying and vexatious laws against them, China has acted more reasonable, if not as just to her own people as perhaps she should, than could be expected of any other. She has consented to suspend that immigration which you once sought, which you regarded as the highest effort of diplomatic skill, and to modify her treaty to that end. Whose course is most like that of the Christian religion, hers or ours? In amity, forbearance, good will, have they not surpassed us? To ask the question is to answer it. I append the following testimonial taken from the Presbyterian Banner, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania:

And in the midst of this disgraceful outburst against an unoffending people, prosperous wherever they go, they are acting in a way creditable to themselves and which at the same time severely rebukes their tormentors. Wherever they are found in this country they are busy and ever ready to learn. Those upon whom Christian care has been bestowed are making decided progress in general knowledge as well as in the Gospel, and not a few of them are Christians. A short time ago the Chinese Mission School in Oakland, California, under the care of Rev. I. M. Condit and wife, from Western Pennsylvania, gave an entertainment which would put to the blush many of those loudest in decrying these children of the Flowery Kingdom. A large number of Chinese and about eighty white persons were present. The school is in a flourishing condition, numbering sixty scholars in regular attendance and fifty-six church members. They are instructed in the Chinese language every evening. Services in the Chinese language are held every Sunday at 11 a. m. and 7 p. m. Two of the former pupils of the mission, Huie Kin and Chin Gim, are students in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, where Dr. Eells, formerly of the Presbyterian church in Oakland, California, is at present a professor. These two young men have been studying at this seminary two years, and intend to return to China after graduation, and, when they have perfected themselves in the language and literature of their own country, will adopt the ministry as a profession.

An encouraging work is in progress among the Chinese in Chicago, under the direction of Rev. William Speer, D.D., who has devoted so much of his life and labors to this race. In Newark, New Jersey, there is also a school in active operation for their benefit. The Chinese schools of both these cities lately gave entertainments in honor of their instructors and friends. And there is hardly a city or town in the older parts of the United States where even a few Chinese are found, in which Christian and philanthropic people are not doing more or less for their benefit. And these labors are highly appreciated by those upon whom they are bestowed. If the present agitation should be successful it will not be creditable to the United States, nor will it inure to our financial advantage, to say nothing of higher considerations. And among the fiercest enemies of the Chinese are those bellowing most lustily about conscription in Germany, persecution in Russia, and landlord tyranny in Ireland. Our history, our institutions, and our present and future character, require that this insane crusade shall come to an end. If it should be successful, it will only be for a time, and the engaged in it will find in the end that they have acted not only wickedly but foolishly.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I have said more than I intended, and I

thank the House for the great courtesy of its attention. [Great applause.]

Mr. BUCKNER. I shall vote for this bill with no little pleasure. I shall vote for it because I believe it is needful to the peace prosperity, and development of the States of the Pacific coast, and is demanded by all classes and conditions of society of that marvelous region. I shall vote for it because the progress of American civilization requires it, and because without it our republican institutions are needlessly and unnecessarily imperiled. And I shall vote for it for another reason, not so apparent or so patent to the superficial observer, but not the less acceptable to every thoughtful American who has a just pride in the glory of his country and in transmitting its institutions unimpaired to the generations that are to succeed us.

This bill is a reversal of the action of this Government for the last thirty years. It consigns to the grave all sublimated sentiment as to the equality of the races of men. It performs the last funeral rite over the dead body of that false and nonsensical dogma of governmental policy that "all men are created equal." It proclaims that this Government will not be controlled in its action on great questions of public policy by the inspiration of our emotions, or legislate under the influence of mere theoretical abstractions as to the natural rights of man. It deals with the practical realities of earth, with men and things as we find them now, with great questions of public economy, and of political and social science as they are presented to us to-day by the light of experience and of history. It seeks to protect and preserve American civilization and American Christianity against the inroads of Asiatic heathenism and Eastern semi-barbarism, and it teaches our people the great lesson that their first and highest duty is to those of their own political household, and to their own blood and their own race.

More than a generation has passed since that great statesman and wonderfully sagacious man, Stephen A. Douglas, in his memorable contest before the people of Illinois for re-election to the Senate, proclaimed the truth that this was a white man's Government, made by white men for white men. He succeeded in his election to the Senate, but the patriotic policy of the brilliant statesman and party leader went down under the gush and false sentiment that elevated his distinguished opponent to the Presidential chair. The real controlling, underlying idea of the election of 1860 was the equality of man and of all men, here and elsewhere—African and Chinaman, Greenlander and Patagonian. The emancipation of the colored population in the South and their subsequent admission to all the rights of citizenship by the incorporation of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments into the Constitution, were the necessary, logical, and inevitable consequence not of the war between the States, but of the assertion in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal—a principle absolutely false when applied to the condition of society existing in the American colonies at the period of its enunciation and afterwards. And now, sir, when we have had but a slight foretaste of the fallacy, if not the criminality, of the practical enforcement of the dogma that all men are entitled to equal rights in this Government of ours, we are called upon to vote for a proposition that not only excludes millions of men from citizenship and suffrage, but which imposes what I hope will be a perpetual prohibition upon their polluting our soil even with the soles of their feet. How true it is that experience ever is contradicting the theories of men.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Chinese immigration ought to be prohibited by any and all legislation consistent with our treaty obligations. No class of population should be permitted to locate in this country who cannot readily assimilate with our race, or whose blood cannot intermingle with that of the white race without deterioration or debasement. The fact that the people of the States and Territories on the Pacific coast, with a unanimity almost unparalleled, have been for years demanding at the hands of Congress such legislation as this bill proposes affords the most conclusive proof that the evil from which they seek relief is real, and that a prompt and certain remedy should be applied. It is incredible that these comparatively young communities, with immense bodies of uncultivated and virgin soil, with great possibilities in the future development of their manufacturing, mineral, and agricultural resources, and with large and increasing demand for labor in all departments of industry, should unite as one man in asking for this relief if they did not realize its pressing necessity. Such a unanimity of sentiment and opinion on a subject that is day after day forcing itself upon their attention amounts to absolute demonstration of the magnitude of the evil which afflicts these communities, and it is doing violence to all experience to treat their apprehensions as unreal, imaginary, or factitious. The essential facts are proved or admitted, and the judgment of the American people is that the Chinese must go. This, I doubt not, will be the action of Congress on this bill.

Whatever may be said as to the past policy of this Government in opening its doors to all grades and classes of men and in offering an asylum to the oppressed and downtrodden populations of the world, the time has come when a just regard to the rights of our own people, especially our laboring population, calls aloud for a change of that policy, and a pronounced reversal of it, and I welcome this measure as a step in that direction. Heretofore we have had vast bodies of the finest agricultural lands in the world which needed the hand of labor and the arm of muscle to develop and to reduce to cul-

tivation. These lands, if not wholly taken up and occupied, are now on the verge of being exhausted, and the fact confronts us that the Government has now comparatively no lands for the landless or homes for the homeless. We have not lands sufficient to make an ordinary county of good arable land in all the vast domains of the Government to which we can invite the refugee from European oppression and from the burdens of depressing taxation. Wherever such lands are found they are already possessed by grasping monopolies, and the water, which alone gives them any value, is preempted by overgrown capital or the agents of speculating corporations.

It is not my purpose to enter into any detail on this subject, but merely to state a fact which is undeniable and susceptible of abundant proof, and to suggest that, if for no other reason than this, the time has arrived when we should not hesitate to say to the hordes of Asiatic semi-barbarians, ready now to be dumped upon the shores of the Pacific, whose habits of life, whose debased and debasing natures, whose immoral and pagan instincts, and whose want of appreciation of our political institutions make their incorporation and assimilation into our body-politic a moral impossibility, that our virgin soil shall not be polluted with their presence nor our laboring population degraded to their level. The small modicum of agricultural lands now remaining to the Government should be reserved for the actual settlement of Americans and those who seek to be Americanized, and no possible intrusion of the Asiatic should be permitted. He is worse than an infidel who will not provide for his own household, and that nation that will not protect its own people against the possibility of having its millions of laborers degraded by contact with the most debased of the offscouring of the Celestial Empire may well merit the judgment of Heaven.

But if it be in the interest of American civilization and of the perpetuity of republican institutions to exclude the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire from our shores, what reason can be assigned that we do not prepare to remove, not by forced expatriation or by any form of coercion, that portion of our population that, like the Chinese, are aliens to our race, whose blood does not mingle with that of the white race without corrupting it, and whose inferiority to the white race is an admitted fact? Shall we permit them to remain as a constituent element of the political power of this country, and continue in all time to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the superior race? Are they to be perpetual impediments to the material advancement and progress of the sections in which they congregate, or are they to be diffused over the whole country, and thus distribute their malign influence in smaller streams to every town and hamlet in the Union? Mr. Speaker, these are questions that thoughtful minds cannot evade or disregard. It may be deemed premature to discuss them now, but the time is not far distant when they will demand solution. Four millions of a race, inferior to the Chinese in some respects—alien to the dominant race, without assimilating or amalgamating capacity with that race—must ever be a source of discord and conflict, and a standing menace to the peace and good order of society. A thoughtful and distinguished Republican Senator has lately said, with great truth, from his place in the Senate, that "their presence is a great misfortune to us to-day, and the question of the adjustment of the relations between the two races socially and politically is no nearer to a settlement now than it was the day that Sumter was fired upon."

The existence of slavery in this Republic was an evil of unspeakable magnitude, and its extirpation, violent, severe, bloody as it was, not only excites no regret, but to me is a source of heart-felt rejoicing. Unfortunately it has failed to eliminate from our political and social system one of its most dangerous elements. Emancipation did not and cannot accomplish what the God of the universe did not ordain. It has not, and it never will, either by education or otherwise, make the African the equal of the white man. His presence as a freedman presents the same if not a greater obstacle to the progress and material development of the States which he inhabits as when he wore the shackles of slavery. It is the negro, and not the slave, that brands labor with degradation, and closes the door against the migration of Europeans to the genial climate of the Southern States, and his cheap labor will produce the same results in the South as Chinese cheap labor has produced on the Pacific slope. His inferiority, felt by none more than by himself, and marked by strong lines of moral, physical, and mental characteristics, has made him, and will ever make him, the foot-ball of party, and an instrument in the hands of unscrupulous and dishonest leaders, of personal ambition, self-aggrandizement, and political corruption. I yield to no one in kindness of feeling to the colored man, and I would advocate no policy that I believe would not ultimately benefit his race. I appreciate his strong attachments, his affectionate sympathies, his religious nature, but I cannot conceal from myself that in the fierce struggle for subsistence which a denser population will make inevitable he must be the sufferer, and his race must yield to the inexorable law of the survival of the fittest and the strongest.

Why cannot we rise to the dignity of this great question and discuss it and deliberate upon it as becomes statesmen and representatives of the foremost people of the world? He who did more to aid in the emancipation of the colored race than all other men looked forward to the time when some provision should be made for supplying them a permanent home, and if living would be foremost in

encouraging any practicable scheme for their growth and development as a race. We owe it to them as well as to ourselves that the two races should be separated, and that they should have full and ample protection in the enjoyment of life and liberty and in the pursuit of happiness, under a government of their own and in the presence of no superior or aggressive race.

The African is here by no act of his. His importation, his enslavement, and his emancipation are alike the shame and glory of our race, and this nation can do itself no higher honor or create a better title to the respect and consideration of future ages than by providing on some part of this continent a home for the African congenial to his nature, free from the intrusion of the white man, and protected by the strong arm of this Government against domestic violence as well as foreign interference.

I have thrown out these suggestions with no expectation that the country is yet ripe for the temperate and calm consideration of the future of the African race on this continent. It may require scores of years of experiment before the country will be convinced that the African is an element of peril and weakness in our social and political system, which, like the Chinese, must be eliminated at any cost. But I have a fixed conviction that every recurring year will add to the number of those who believe that voluntary colonization and a separation of the two races can alone furnish a solution to this difficult problem. In the mean time I congratulate the country upon its return to the domain of practical wisdom and common sense in its treatment of the Chinese question and its repudiation of the fallacious dogma that men of every name and tribe and people have equal rights with ourselves in this Union of ours. And I congratulate my Republican friends who support this bill that they have emancipated themselves for once from the influence of transcendental theorists, sublimated humanitarians, Jesuitical ecclesiastics, woman suffragists, and that numerous class who seek to

Compound for sins they are inclined to  
By damning those they have no mind to.

Mr. WASHBURN obtained the floor.

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman will yield to me, as it is late, and as our reporters are tired out from the long night session and to-day's labor, I will move the House adjourn.

Mr. WASHBURN. I will yield for that purpose.

#### TERMS OF COURT IN NORTHERN NEW YORK.

Mr. HISCOCK. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, for the purpose of moving concurrence in the Senate amendments, the bill (H. R. No. 4439) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States establishing the times, places, and provisions for holding terms of the district and circuit courts of the northern district of New York.

The bill is a bill fixing the terms of court in the northern district of New York, and the amendments make the notice as to fixing one of the terms a little more specific.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be considered at this time. They will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 14, strike out the words "and notice thereof."

Page 1, line 14, strike out the words "given in such manner as said judge shall determine" and insert the words "made by notice of at least twenty days, published in the State paper of New York and one newspaper published at the place where said court is to be held."

Mr. HISCOCK. I move that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in.

The amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

Mr. HISCOCK moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments of the Senate were concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### MILITARY QUARTERS AT FORT LEAVENWORTH.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a communication from the Secretary of War, dated the 18th instant, inclosing plans and estimates for a brick building for the post of Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to contain quarters for two companies of troops, to replace the one destroyed by fire on the 1st February last, and recommending an appropriation of \$18,745.77 in accordance with the estimates.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 21, 1882.

#### NAVAL EQUIPMENT AND RECRUITING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Navy calling attention to the necessity of appropriating the sum of \$12,000 under the head of contingent equipment and recruiting, for immediate use, to defray accruing expenses during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

The matter is commended to the favorable consideration of Congress.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 21, 1882.

## UNITED STATES SIGNAL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a House resolution of February 9, a statement of expenditures for support of United States Signal Service, which have been made from the appropriations for the support of the Army from 1875 to 1881, inclusive; also information as to how and by whom the Signal Service accounts are audited; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

## COMPENSATION OF DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, ETC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and accompanying documents, recommending a change in the mode of compensating district attorneys, marshals, deputy marshals, and circuit court clerks; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

## IMPROVEMENT OF OSAGE RIVER.

Mr. RICE, of Missouri. I ask that by unanimous consent a bill which was introduced through the petition box and appropriately referred, for the improvement of the Osage River in the State of Missouri, be printed.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. No. 5369) for the improvement of the Osage River by locks and dams, and making an appropriation therefor, was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

## ADMISSION OF DAKOTA.

Mr. LEEDOM, by unanimous consent, presented the views of a minority of the Committee on Territories against the admission of the Territory of Dakota; which were ordered to be printed with the report of the majority.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BEACH for three days.

## REPORT ON REORGANIZATION OF THE NAVY.

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. I ask that report No. 653 be printed. It is entirely exhausted, and there is a great demand for it.

The SPEAKER. What is the subject of the report?

Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts. The report is on the subject of the reorganization of the Navy.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

## BEAUFORT C. LEE.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts:

*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of this House be, and he is hereby, directed to place the name of Beaufort C. Lee upon the laborers' roll in the cloak-room of this House, and he be paid out of the contingent fund of this House at the same rate of compensation that is now paid for like services, and that he be continued during the session.

## GOVERNMENT RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, dated the 6th instant, with accompanying papers, submitting draft of a bill to authorize payment for Government transportation on certain railroads.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 21, 1882.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (S. No. 650) to authorize the Secretary of War to release a right of way across lands of the United States at Plattsburgh, New York.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: The resolutions adopted by the Vessel-Owners' and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, asking Congress to make appropriations for certain improvements in the Delaware River so as to improve its navigation—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNE: The petition of Joseph P. Walton and 38 others and of William H. Study and 67 others, ex-soldiers and citizens of the sixth Congressional district of Indiana, remonstrating against placing General U. S. Grant on the retired list—severally to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEUSTER: The petition of F. F. Adams & Co. and others, tobacco manufacturers of Milwaukee Wisconsin, protesting against

any reduction of the present tax on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, the petition of J. Fiesel and 70 others, glass-blowers of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, relative to the duty on manufactured glass—to the same committee.

By Mr. GUENTHER: The joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, relative to the school and swamp lands certified and patented by the United States to that State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. N. J. HAMMOND: The petition of Roderick Rutland, for a duplicate land warrant—to the same committee.

By Mr. HARMER: The resolutions of the Vessel-Owners' and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, relative to certain improvements in the Delaware River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY S. HARRIS: The resolutions of the Vessel-Owners' and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the improvement of the Delaware River and Bay—to the same committee.

By Mr. HUMPHREY: The joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, relating to claims of said State against the United States for swamp and overflowed lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. J. K. JONES: The petition of citizens of Clark County, Arkansas, asking for a survey of Ouachita River, between Arkadelphia and Camden, in that State—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY: The petition of the Woman's Suffrage Association of Pennsylvania, protesting against the admission of Dakota as a State unless the right of suffrage is extended to women—to the Committee on Territories.

Also, the resolutions of the National Tobacco Association, relating to the abolition of export stamps, changes of the law in regard to exportation of tobacco by rail, and charges as to fees paid to inspectors of export tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the National Tobacco Association, relative to the tax on tobacco—to the same committee.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Memorial of Edgar Waters and others, in opposition to the adoption of the French metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MORSE: The petition of Elizabeth G. Fifield and of Martha P. R. Codman and A. D. Wetmore, for the passage of the French spoliation claims bill—severally to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: The petition of John Elder, D. C. Irish, and 206 others, residents of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, praying that prompt action may be taken by Congress to suppress polygamy in the Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPEER: The petition of citizens of Savannah, Georgia, for the construction of a canal through Romney marsh, near said city—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SPOONER: The petition of Mary E. Matthews, widow of the late Edw. S. Matthews, late surgeon of the United States Navy, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HORN: The petition of 37 citizens of Gallipolis, Ohio, of 38 citizens of Rodney, Mississippi, and of 78 citizens of Kellogg's Landing, Louisiana, in favor of an appropriation for the improvement of Lake Borgne outlet—severally to the Committee on Commerce.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1882.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a communication from the Secretary of War, dated the 18th instant, inclosing plans and estimates for a brick building for the post of Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to contain quarters for two companies of troops, to replace the one destroyed by fire on the 1st of February last, and recommending an appropriation of \$18,745.77, in accordance with the estimates.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 21, 1882.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* also laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, calling attention to the necessity of appropriating the sum of \$12,000, under the head of "Contingent equipment and recruiting," for immediate use to defray accruing expenses during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

The matter is commended for the favorable consideration of Congress.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 21, 1882.